SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA
II

L. PETECH

NORTHERN INDIA ACCORDING TO THE SHUI-CHING-CHU



ROMA
ISTITUTO ITALIANO PER IL MEDIO ED ESTREMO ORIENTE
1950

ROME ORIENTAL SERIES

Forthcoming Books:

J. F. Rock — *THE NA-KHI NĀGA CULT AND RELATED CEREMONIES.*

In preparation:

G. Tucci, A. Gargano — *THE ABHIDHARMASAMUCCAYA KĀRIKĀ BY SANGHATRĀTA,* text and commentary of an unknown work, the Sanskrit manuscript of which has been found in Tibet.

G. Tucci — *A COMMENTARY ON THE VAJRACCHEDIKĀ BY ASAṄGA,* Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese.

G. Tucci, L. Petech — *GRUB MT'A'-ŚEL-GYI-ME-LOṄ,* (Crystal mirror of the philosophical and religious systems), translated from the Tibetan.

G. Tucci, L. Petech — *THE FIFTH DALAI-LAMA'S CHRONICLE OF TIBET,* translated from the Tibetan.

NORTHERN INDIA ACCORDING TO THE SHUI-CHING-CHU

ISTITUTO ITALIANO PER IL MEDIO
ED ESTREMO ORIENTE

SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA

SOTTO LA DIREZIONE
DI
GIUSEPPE TUCCI

VOLUME II

ROMA
Is. M. E. O.
1950

SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA
II

L. PETECH

NORTHERN INDIA ACCORDING TO THE SHUI-CHING-CHU

ROMA
Is. M. E. O.
1950

Printed in Italy – Stampato in Italia

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Giuseppe Tucci for the loan of books, for discussing with me several doubtful points and for some valuable suggestions; to Professor J. J. L. Duyvendak for help in two difficult passages; to Professor Paul Demiéville for having procured for me the microfilm reproductions of some Chinese texts and articles not available in Rome; and to Professor H. W. Bailey for advice on Central Asian data relevant to my subject.

Rome, June 1950.

L. PETECH

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASIAR	= Archaeological Survey of India Annual Reports.	
BEFEO	= Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient.	
BSOS	= Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies.	
HJAS	= Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.	
IHQ	= Indian Historical Quarterly.	
J. As.	= Journal Asiatique.	
JASB	= Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.	
JRAS	= Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.	
MASI	= Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.	
MDAFA	= Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan.	
SS	= *Shui-ching-chu*, edition of Shên Ping-hsün	for particulars see p. 2
ST	= *Shui-ching-chu*, edition of Tai Chên	
SW	= *Shui-ching-chu*, edition of Wang Hsien-ch'ien	
SY	= *Shui-ching-chu*, edition of Yang Hsi-min	
Taishō	= Taishō Issaikyō edition of the Chinese Buddhist Canon.	
TP	= T'oung Pao.	
ZDMG	= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.	

INTRODUCTION *

The travels of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims to India have always drawn a great deal of attention from Western scholars; so have also the accounts of India and its kingdoms found scattered in the twenty-four dynastic histories of China. But, strange to say, there is one Chinese text which has not yet received its due consideration, at least as far as India is concerned.[1] This text is the Water Classic and its commentary.

The *Shui-ching* 水經 (Water Classic) is a small text traditionally attributed to the Han dynasty, but probably written during the Three Kingdoms period (220-265). It was commented upon by Li Tao-yüan 酈道元 (d. 527), an official of the Southern Chinese Ch'i and Liang dynasties. His work, the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注 (Commentary on the Water Classic) has much suffered in the long run of time. The Classic and the commentary got confounded with each other, and not till the 18th century was the work fully restored, thanks to the unremitting labour of three Chinese scholars, who worked

*) The system of transcription followed is Wade-Giles. Ancient (6th century A. D.) pronunciation of Chinese is given according to KARLGREN, *Analytic dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, Paris, 1923. Quotations of the Dynastic Histories refer to the Po-na-pên 百衲本 edition of the Commercial Press (Shanghai, 1936).

1) Even a painstaking and industrious compilator like CHANG HSING-LANG 張星烺 has wholly omitted the *Shui-ching-chu* from his digest of Chinese materials on India (*Chung-hsi-chiao-t'ung-shih-liao-hui-p'ien* 中西交通史料匯篇, vol. VI, Peking, 1930).

independently of each other but arrived at practically the same results.[1]

For my translation I have used the edition prepared by Tai Chên 戴震 and printed in 1774 in the official collectanea *Wu-ying-tien-chü-chên-pan-ts'ung-shu* 武英殿聚珍版叢書; photographic reprint in the *Ssŭ-pu-ts'ung-k'an* 西部叢刊, series of 1936. In textual notes it is quoted as ST. I have checked it throughout with the following three editions:

The *Shui-ching-chu hui-chiao* 水經注匯校, published at Foochow in 1881 and reproducing the collation made by Yang Hsi-min 楊希閔 in 1865; its text is that of Tai Chên, but some of the notes are interesting. Quoted by the initials SY.

The *Ho-chiao shui-ching-chu* 合校水經注 of Wang Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙 (1842-1918), published in 1892. According to Chêng Tê-k'un 鄭德坤, this is the best edition existing.[2] It follows the text of Tai Chên, but gives a large number of variants and some interesting notes. Quoted by the initials SW.

The *Shui-ching-chu chi-shih ting-ê* 水經注集釋訂譌 prepared in 1724-1731 by Shên Ping-hsün 沈炳巽 and re-published in the *Ssŭ-k'u-ch'üan-shu-chên-pên* 四庫全書珍本 (1935). This old, pre- Tai Chên edition, among several mis-takes, has preserved some good readings, which Tai Chên was wrong in rejecting. Quoted by the initials SS.

1) See HU SHIH, Note on Ch'üan Tsu-wang, Chao I-ch'ing and Tai Chên, in HUMMEL, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, Washington, 1943-4, pp. 970-982.

2) *Index to the Water Classic* (Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series, vol. XII), Peiping, 1934.

I have also consulted the contributions of Chung Fêng-nien 鍾鳳年;[1] they give, however, no important variants to the section of the text which interests us.

The *Shui-ching-chu* began to attract the attention of Western scholars about half a century ago, and some good work has already been done on it.[2] It is a fine piece of Chinese scholarship. Li Tao-yüan was no traveller, but as a desk geographer he ranks high, chiefly because he used very good sources, some of which are now lost. In the words of R. Stein, Li Tao-yüan wrote animated above all by an interest "for the miraculous, religious, folkloristic and sociological facts". Besides his purely hydrographical researches, he busied himself mainly "with localizing facts which we would call historical, but which deserve rather the appellation of heroical: holy places, rare and extraordinary produce, strange customs, apparitions, legends, in short the *mirabilia*".[3]

In the case of India, Li Tao-yüan, although a Confucianist with some Taoist leanings, avails himself almost exclusively of the Buddhistic tradition, without paying much attention to the materials elaborated up to his time in the various dynastic histories. He employs the traditional Buddhist cosmography, which derives directly from the Hindu. The various localities of Northern India are described only from the point of view of Buddhist lore. The author, however, does not base himself on the canonical texts, but on the travel accounts and the geographical

1) *Shui-ching-chu chiao-pu-chih-i* 水經注校補質疑 (Materials and conjectures for the emendation and critic of the *Shui-ching-chu*), in « Yenching Journal of Chinese Studies », n. 32 (June, 1947), pp. 1-96.

2) E. g. the researches of R. STEIN on its 36th *chüan* concerning Lin-i, the Champa kingdom of later times. STEIN, *Le Lin-yi* (Bulletin du Centre d'études sinologiques de Pekin, vol. II), Peking, 1947.

3) Op. cit., p. 3.

compilations of the Chinese pilgrims who went to visit the sacred places of Buddhism. His materials are not elaborated, but merely juxtaposed; Li Tao-yüan intervenes only with some occasional remarks, and these are seldom illuminating and sometimes directly misleading. It is therefore imperative to extricate the *disjecta membra* of his sources.[1]

The paragraphs concerning India form the greater part of ch. 1 (which we shall call section A) and a small portion at the beginning of ch. 2 (which we shall call section B). The whole of section A represents Li Tao-yüan's commentary upon the following words of the Water Classic: "It (the Ho river 河水) turns to the south-east of it (the K'un-lun) and flows into the P'o-hai 渤海 (Gulf of Chih-li)" (f. 4 *a*). Section B comments upon these words of the Classic: "The Ho river again enters the Ts'ung-ling to the south; again it comes out of the Ts'ung-ling and flows to the north-east" (f. 1 *a*).

Considering the two sections as a whole, the sources cited in them are the following:

1) The *Fa-hsien-chuan* 法顯傳 (Account of Fa-hsien). It is Li Tao-yüan's main source. As it is well known and fairly well studied, the longer quotations from it are summarized in the present study, not translated in full. For the text I have followed the edition in *Taishō*, vol. LI, n. 2085;[2] but I have

1) Some spade work in this direction has already been done by HERRMANN, *Die Westländer in der chinesischen Kartographie*, in SVEN HEDIN, *Southern Tibet*, vol. VIII, Stockholm, 1922, pp. 89-406.

2) The textual problems in the text of Fa-hsien, arising out of its long quotations in the *Shui-ching-chu*, have been studied by SHIKAZO MORI 森鹿三, *Suikyōchu inyō no hokkenden* 水經注引用之法顯傳 (The Fa-hsien-chuan in the quotations of the Shui-ching-chu), in the *Tōbō Gakubō*, I (1931), pp. 183-212; they do not concern us here.

accepted Remusat's very convenient division of the text in forty small chapters. For the translation, I refer to LEGGE's *Record of Buddhistic kingdoms*, Oxford, 1886, which is still preferable to the last translation published, H. A. GILES's *Travels of Fa-hsien*, Cambridge, 1923.

2) The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* 釋氏西域記 (Records of the Western Countries by a Buddhist monk). It is now lost, except for the fragments included in the *Shui-ching-chu* and for some quotations in the *Pien-i-tien*.[1] It is unknown from any other source, and this naturally invites the suspicion that it is here quoted under a title different from the original. Thus in 1905 the Chinese scholar Yang Shou-ching 楊守敬 (1839-1914) identified the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* with the *Hsi-yü-chih* 西域志, a lost work in one *chüan* by Tao-an 道安 (d. 385). But there are several difficulties in the way of this theory,[2] and there is one element which goes straight against it: the description of Rājagṛha by Tao-an, preserved in the *Yüan-chien-lei-han* 淵鑑類函,[3] is quite different from the description by the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* in § 39 of the present work. From the fragments of the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* included in the *Shui-ching-chu* we can infer the main outlines of the lost work. It was a compilation and not a travel account; it is also certain that it owes nothing to Fa-hsien, and seems rather to be earlier than the great pilgrim. It included some account of cosmography, a description (perhaps short) of the Indus valley, a detailed account of the Buddhistic holy places in the Ganges valley, and a description of Central Asia.

1) S. LÉVI, *Le Tokharien B, langue de Koutcha*, in J. As., 1913 II, p. 447.

2) On the question see PELLIOT, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, in J. As., 1934 I, pp. 76-77. On Tao-an's work see CHAVANNES, *Voyage de Song Yun dans l'Udyāna et le Gandhāra*, in BEFEO, III (1903), p. 436.

3) The Ch'ing encyclopaedia of 1710. Ch. 316, f. 2 *a*.

3) The work of the Indian (Chu) Fa-wei 竺法維, of whom very little is known.[1] From a quotation in the *T'ung-tien* 通典[2] we learn that the name of the work was *Fo-kuo-chi* 佛國記 (Record of the Buddhistic kingdoms).

4) The *Wai-kuo-shih* 外國事 (Matters concerning the foreign kingdoms) by the [Yüeh-]chih monk Sêng-tsai 支僧載, of the Chin dynasty (265-420). Beyond the fragments included in the *Shui-ching-chu*,[3] there are some (partly parallel) quotations in the *Yüan-chien-lei-han*, ch. 316, f. 2 *a*.

5) The *Fu-nan-chuan* 扶南傳 (Account of Fu-nan) by K'ang T'ai 康泰. It is the travel account of a Chinese ambassador who was sent to Fu-nan (the Khmer empire of later times, now Cambodia) by the emperors of the Wu dynasty in Southern China (222-280). In the hinduized kingdom of Fu-nan, K'ang T'ai obtained much information on India, which he embodied in his report. It is now lost, but we have several passages quoted in the *Shui-ching-chu*, the *Liang-shu* 梁書, the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽 and the *T'ung-tien*.[4]

6) The *Kuang-chih* 廣志 (Expanded treatise) by Kuo I-kung 郭義恭, who wrote under the Chin dynasty (265-420). It is now lost, but the fragments have been collected in two *chüan* by Ma Kuo-han 馬國翰 (1794-1857) and included in his *Yü-han-shan-fang-chi-i-shu* 玉函山房輯佚書.[5]

1) See the short notice in the *Kao-sêng-chuan* 高僧傳 translated by CHAVANNES, *Voyage de Song Yun*, p. 437.

2) By Tu Yu 杜佑 (735-812). *Shih-t'ung* 十通 edition of the Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1935, ch. 193, p. 1040 *b*.

3) These have been collected in the *Hai-kuo-t'u-chih* 海國圖志 of 1844. JULIEN, *Reinseignements bibliographiques* etc., in J. As., 1847 II, p. 274.

4) They have been studied by PELLIOT, *Le Fou-nan*, in BEFEO, III (1903), pp. 271 and 275-276.

5) For some quotations see also LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*, Chicago, 1919, Index; and *Malabathron*, in J. As., 1918 II, pp. 28 and 34-35 *n*.

7) The *Fu-nan-chi* 扶南記 (Account of Fu-nan) by Chu Chih 竺枝 a man of Indian origin who wrote in the second half of the 5th century.[1]

8) The *Fo-t'u-t'iao-chuan* 佛圖調傳 (Narrative of Fo-t'u-t'iao). Its author is otherwise unknown.[2] The name seems to be a transcription of Buddhadeva.

The following table shows the number of the quotations and the approximate number of words concerning India from the above eight works; I have also included some passages which have no expressed attribution, but which are palpably derived from the *Fa-hsien-chuan* or the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi.*

	QUOTATIONS	WORDS
Fa-hsien	27	2185
The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi*	17	520
Chu Fa-wei	5	257
Chih Sêng-tsai	4	844
K'ang T'ai	4	270
Kuo I-kung	2	105
Chu Chih	2	128
Fo-t'u-t'iao	2	54
The *Han-shu*	2	54

1) See PELLIOT, *Le Fou-nan*, p. 280.

2) See PELLIOT, *Deux itinéraires de la Chine en Inde*, in BEFEO, IV (1904), p. 268 *n*. According to Shên Ta-ch'êng 沈大成 (1700-1771), quoted in SY, ch. 1, f. 12 *a*, Fo-t'u-t'iao is but another name for Fo-t'u-têng 佛圖澄, the famous Indian monk who played such an important part at the court of the first emperor of the Later Chao dynasty, Shih Lo (319-333); see his biography translated by A. F. WRIGHT, *Fo-t'u-têng*, in HJAS, XI (1948), pp. 321-371. But this identification lacks support, nor is Fo-t'u-t'iao found among the recorded variants of the name Fo-t'u-têng. I would rather think of Chu Fo-t'iao 竺佛調, who was a disciple of Fo-t'u-têng and was probably of Indian origin. But his biography in ch. 9 of the *Kao-sêng-chuan* (*Taishō*, L, pp. 387 *c*-388 *a*) does not mention his having written a geographical work.

From this table it follows that the account of India is a mosaic, of which about the half is drawn from Fa-hsien.

There is one peculiarity which strikes the reader at once: although the *Shui-ching-chu* was compiled at the beginning of the 6th century, all of these materials are much older. Fa-hsien is probably the latest, and the rest go back to the 4th and even 3rd century. Political conditions at the time of compilation are wholly ignored. When Li Tao-yüan was writing, modern Afghanistan belonged to the Chionites or Hephthalites, wrongly also called White Huns. They were divided into two branches; the one ruled a mighty state north of the Hindukush and for a time imposed tribute even on the Sassanid empire; the other held sway south of the mountains, with their centre round Ghazni (Zabulistan) and extending their rule also over Kāpiśi and Gandhāra.[1] But when the *Shui-ching-chu* comes to describe the lands north of the Hindukush, it merely repeats the old tales of the Yüeh-chih and the Sai-wang, going back to the times of the Han.[2] For the lands south of the Hindukush, it brings nothing except religious matters; Fa-hsien reigns nearly undisputed. In India proper the kingdom of the Imperial and the Later Guptas is wholly ignored (as indeed it is by Fa-hsien), and political information is practically lacking. We may conclude these remarks by saying that the material of the *Shui-ching-chu* on India is nearly exclusively Buddhist and of religious character, and is older than the *Shui-ching-chu* by at least a century.

The hydrography of Northern India is largely fictitious. The Ganges of the *Shui-ching-chu* is not so much a real river, as

1) See now GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Cairo, 1948.
2) Ch. 2, f. 1 *a-b*; left untranslated in the present study.

a thread in the narrative, by which the places and regions describ-ed are somehow brought into relation with each other. Li Tao-yüan or his sources have not much regard for geographical facts, and sometimes the bearings are interchanged, as when the Ganges is made to flow north of Vaiśālī, Sāketa and Kapilavastu, or when in Magadha it flows from east of west simply because Fa-hsien happened to travel in that direction. The fictitiousness of the hydrographical sequence is the main reason why I have preferred to study the text quotation by quotation and not as a whole, even if this may appear to hinder a proper appreciation of Li Tao-yüan's work. But in this chapter it is the quotations alone which offer some interest; the slender contribution of Li Tao-yüan in the way of connecting text can safely be left out of consideration.

SECTION A

(from ch. 1)

4 *b* **1.** The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that A-nou-ta 阿耨達 (Anavatapta) is a great mountain. Upon it there is a large and deep water pool and a kingly palace, the towers of which are very large. This mountain now is the K'un-lun 崐崙 mountain.

The form A-nou-ta (ancient *·â-nəu-d'ât*) is common to all the older translations in the Chinese Tripiṭaka. According to WATTERS, it transcribes the Pali Anotatta.[1] But PELLIOT has pointed out that *-ta* implies a sonant dental and that the original must rather have been *Anodatta.[2] This goes to show that the name was known to the Chinese under a form current in the Prakrit of Central Asia.

On the K'un-lun of Central Asia, a subject which lies outside the limits of the present work, there are older studies by De Saussure, Ferrand etc.; but the best investigations are due to SVEN HEDIN and HERRMANN in vol. VIII of *Southern Tibet*; and to EBERHARD, *Lokalkulturen im alten China*, vol. I, Leiden, 1942, pp. 245-248, where much material is conveniently gathered. For K'un-lun as the source of the Huangho according to the *Han-shu*, and its later divorce from that river and

1) *On Yüan Chwang's travels*, London, 1904, vol. I, p. 34.

2) Review of WATTERS' book in BEFEO, V (1905), p. 436. For the transcription value of 達 (*da* or *dha*, never *ta*) see S. LÉVI, *Le catalogue des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyurī*, in J. As., 1915[I], p. 131.

identification with Anavatapta, see HEDIN, op. cit., pp. 10-13. In any case it remains certain that in the age of the *Shui-ching-chu* the name K'un-lun applied to Western and Central Himalaya.

2. The *Mu-t'ien-tzŭ-chuan* 穆天子傳 says that the Son of Heaven ascended the K'un-lun in order to see the palace of Huang-ti 黃帝 and to raise the mound on the tomb of Fêng-lung 豐隆. Fêng-lung is the god of thunder. The palace of Huang-ti is thus the palace on the A-nou-ta.

This paragraph is a kind of explanatory note inserted by Li Tao-yüan in the middle of a quotation from the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi*. If according to the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* the K'un-lun is identical with the Anavatapta, then all the particulars attributed to the two mountains must coincide. As the oldest extant account of the K'un-lun is that of the *Mu-t'ien-tzŭ-chuan*, the comparison with this old book imposes itself.

The *Mu-t'ien-tzŭ-chuan* is an account of the travels and sports of king Mu in the western borderlands of old China, which took place in the 10th century B. C. The work was found in an old tomb which was opened in 280 or 281 A. D. As we have it, it is certainly heavily interpolated, but its nucleus seems to be authentic. The passage in question[1] is comprised in that section of the text which describes the voyage to the fabulous Hsi-wang-mu 西王母, a queen or a population in the extreme West; this section has been conclusively shown to be an interpolation posterior to the finding of the work in 280-1 A. D.[2]

1) *Mu-t'ien-tzŭ-chuan* (*Ssŭ-pu-ts'ung-k'an* edition, Shanghai, 1936), ch. 2, f. 9*b*. It is § 22 in the translation of EITEL, *Mu-t'ien-tsze-chuen*, or narrative of the son of heaven (postumously called) Mu, in *China Review*, XVII (1888-9), p. 230.

2) See DE SAUSSURE, *Le voyage du roi Mou au Turkestan Oriental,* in J. As., 1920[II], pp. 151-156; id., *La relation de voyage du roi Mou (au IX siècle avant J. C.)*, in J. As., 1921[I], pp. 247-280; and above all HERRMANN, *Die Westländer in der chinesischen Kartographie*, pp. 183-186.

The K'un-lun of the *Mu-t'ien-tzŭ-chuan* has nothing to do with the Himalaya; even if it is not, as maintained by HERRMANN and others, the name of an ancient people of Central Asia, it cannot but be sought for in the ranges on the western border of the original Chinese homeland in the Huangho basin.[1] But this does not disturb Li Tao-yüan in the least.

Huang-ti is the mythical founder of Chinese culture, who according to tradition lived in the third millennium B. C.

Fêng-lung is a personage of not very common occurrence in Chinese mythology; he is mentioned, however, as the god of thunder in the *Li-sao* 離騷, str. 57, and in Huai-nan-tzŭ 淮南子 ("Hundred philosophers" edition of the Sao-yeh shan-fang fa-hsing 掃葉山房發行, Shanghai, 1922), ch. 3, f. 3 *b*.[2]

5 *a* **3.** From this mountain six great rivers issue. To the west of the mountain there is the great river called Hsin-t'ou 新頭 (Sindhu).

This paragraph is really the continuation of § 1, after the interruption caused by Li Tao-yüan's discussion in § 2. It continues therefore the quotation from the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi.*

The hydrography of this passage is fundamental; it lies at the basis of the whole first two *chüans* of the *Shui-ching-chu.* The hydrography of the Buddhist texts can be divided into two great traditions. According to the cosmology of the canonical and post-canonical texts, the great rivers of Jambudvīpa are five: Gangā, Yamunā, Sarabhū (Sarda), Aciravatī (Rapti)

1) The equation with Anavatapta belongs to a much later period. On the whole question of the meaning of K'un-lun in the first millennium B.C., see the above quoted works of Hedin and Eberhard, and particularly HALOUN, *Seit wann kannten die Chinesen die Tocharer oder Indogermanen überhaupt*, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 163-172.

2) See also the short note by H. MASPERO, *Legendes mythologiques dans le Chou-king*, in J. As., 1924^{I}, p. 57 *n*.

and Mahī (near Gayā): it is a purely Indian list. The tradi-tion of Northern Buddhism prefers another scheme: we have the Anavatapta (the unheated), a lake on the top of the Himalaya, with a Nāga king presiding over it; four rivers issue from the lake: the Gangā to the east, the Sindhu to the south, the Vakṣu (Oxus) to the west and the Sītā (Tarim) to the north; this list spreads over the whole of Middle Asia.[1] The hydrography of the *Shui-ching-chu* shows a contamination of the two traditions. Li Tao-yüan has adopted the ideas of the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi*, of which work the present para is almost certainly a quotation. The change of the Anavatapta into a mountain is due to the influence of the K'un-lun and perhaps also of the Meru. The six rivers are made up of the four of the northern traditions, but with names partly changed: Indus, Ganges, I-lo-ch'i-ti (for which see §§ 57-60 and 65; corresponding mainly to the Oxus) and the great A-nou-ta river (described in ch. 2, f. 6 *a*; seems to correspond to the Cherchen-darya and Tarim). To these are added two of the rivers of the southern tradition: Yao-nu and Sa-han (Yamunā and Sarayū; for both see § 12).

This hydrography, and chiefly the change of the Anavatapta into a mountain, left few traces in the later geographical tradi-tion, which soon came to be deeply influenced by Hsüan-tsang and generally by the enormous widening of geographical know-ledge which took place in the times of the T'ang dynasty. Still, it is echoed in the *Kua-ti-chih* 括地志, written in 642 by Hsiao Tê-yen 蕭德言 (558-654), which speaks of the A-nou-ta, identical with the K'un-lun, and of the Ganges issuing from it.[2]

1) See the interesting note in LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*, Louvain, 1944-49, pp. 385-386 *n*.

2) The *Kua-ti-chih* is now lost; its fragments were collected and published in 1797 by Sun Hsing-yen 孫星衍 in his great collection *Tai-nan-ko-ts'ung-shu* 岱南閣叢書.

4. The *Kuang-chih* of Kuo I-kung says that the Sweet River (甘水) is in the eastern part of the Western Countries (西域); its name is river Hsin-t'ao 新陶. The mountain [from which it issues] is to the west of the T'ien-chu 天竺 region (India). Its water is sweet, therefore it is called Sweet River.

The surname "sweet" given to the Indus is difficult to account for; there seems to be no parallel for this in Indian sources. The passage is perhaps corrupted, as we cannot otherwise explain the situation of the Indus in the eastern part of the Western Countries.

5. There is rock-salt as white as rock crystal in large pieces; it is quarried and employed. K'ang T'ai says that An-hsi 安息 (Persia), the Yüeh-chih 月氏, T'ien-chu (India), as far as Ch'ia-na-t'iao-yü 伽那調御, all of them have the highest opinion of this salt.

The mention of rock-salt refers of course to the Salt Range in the Panjab between the Indus and the Jhelam.

The interesting name Chia-na-t'iao (the addition of the last character -*yü* is due to some clerical error) will be discussed under § 55.

6. The monk Fa-hsien says that after he had passed the Tsung-ling 葱嶺, he entered the territory of Northern India. From this place he followed the range to the south-west for 15 days etc. [*omitted*].

Follows a verbatim reproduction of the first half of ch. 7 of the *Fa-hsien-chuan*, describing the pilgrim's journey through the Hanging Passages; cfr. LEGGE, pp. 26-27.

Towards the end of this passage, the text of Fa-hsien has the words 九譯所紀, and then goes on to say that neither Chang Ch'ien nor Kan Ying (the famous explorers of the 2nd-1st

As this is not available to me, I quote from the *Shih-chi chêng-i* 史記正義, i. e. the commentary on the *Shih-chi* by Szu-ma Chêng 司馬貞 (8th century), ap. *Shih-chi*, ch. 123, f. 7*b*. Cfr. CHAVANNES, Review of MARQUART's *Eranshahr*, in J. As. 1901^II, p. 555; and FRANKE, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Türkvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens*, Berlin, 1904, p. 36.

centuries B. C.) reached this spot.[1] Legge translates the four characters as "[the places and the arrangements] are to be found in the Records of the Nine Interpreters".[2] No such records ever existed, and the translation is wrong: 九譯 is a not un-common idiom in the dynastic histories, and means in every case "through nine translations", i. e. "through many linguistic borders".[3] But the question is complicated by the fact that the *Shui-ching-chu* (ST, SW and SY) has for the last charac-ter the variant 絕, "to interrupt". If we accept the reading 紀, which seems to me preferable, then the meaning is: "[This is] the account [which has come to us] through ninefold trans-lations (i. e. through many intermediaries), since neither Chang Ch'ien nor Kan Ying reached this spot". The reading 絕 which is still well attested, gives a less satisfactory meaning: "[Access to the place] is precluded by ninefold translations (i. e. by the enormous distance), so that neither Chang Ch'ien nor Kan Ying reached this spot".

5 *b* 7. I have examined all the accounts in the chronicles, and this is what they say. The country of Chi-pin 罽賓 has a mountain trail made of stone slabs. The path is about one foot wide. The travellers walk step by step clasping each other. Rope bridges are following each other for more than 20 *li*, till one arrives to the Hanging Passages (縣度). The difficulties and dangers are indescribable.

1) *Taishō*, vol. LI, p. 858 *a*.

2) LEGGE, pp. 26-27. GILES, *Travels of Fa-hsien*, p. 10: "According to the Records of the Nine Interpreters".

3) See e. g. *Shih-chi*, ch. 123, f. 8 *b* (= *Han-shu*, ch. 61, f. 3 *a*): 重九譯, "countries which are reached through many, ninefold translations". *Chiu T'ang-shu*, ch. 130, f. 4 *b*: 萬里毘夷九譯而通, "from 10.000 *li* the barbarians through nine translations come to visit us". A similar idiom 重譯, with the same meaning of numerous linguistic borders, occurs in Huai-nan-tzŭ, ch. 20, f. 2 *a*, in *Hou Han-shu*, ch. 118 (88 in the *Po-na-pên*), f. 3 *a*, etc.; it has remained fairly common in the documentary style.

This paragraph and part of § 8 have been translated by FRANKE.[1] The words from " The travellers walk ... " till "... to the Hanging Passages " are a quotation from *Han-shu*, ch. 96 *a*, f. 12 *b*. Our text brings even a good textual emendation; the current editions of the *Han-shu* have 二千里 " 2000 li ", while the reading of the *Shui-ching-chu*, 二十里 " 20 li " is undoubtedly the original one.

On Chi-pin see the Appendix. There seems to be no agreement about the exact position of the Hanging Passages, a name which often occur in the earlier Chinese accounts of the Pamir till the time of Hsüan-tsang. Fa-hsien's description certainly refers to the difficult passage along the Indus below Darel, west of Gilgit.[2] It is a controversial point whether these Hanging Passages are the same as those of the *Han-shu*. According to STEN KONOW they are the same.[3] According to HEDIN and HERRMANN they are not, and the Hanging Passages of the *Han-shu* must be sought for in Hunza (Kanjut), east of Gilgit; [4] the latter opinion suits better the geographical conditions (see the following paragraph).

Our text, as it stands, seems to include the Hanging Passages in Chi-pin. But what we have here is simply a patched-up quotation from the *Han-shu*, and the latter work makes it clear that the Hanging Passages are on the route to Chi-pin, but not in Chi-pin.

The meaning of Chi-pin is here uncertain, but as the ultimate source is the *Han-shu*, the probability is more in favour of Gandhāra-Kāpiśi than of Kashmir.

1) *Beiträge* etc., p. 58.

2) See the discussion in Sir Aurel STEIN, *Serindia*, Oxford, 1921, p. 8.

3) KONOW, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, voll. II-I (*Kharoshthi Inscriptions*), Calcutta, 1929, p. xxiii.

4) *Southern Tibet*, vol. VIII, pp. 6-7, 32.

For the value of the *li* in the *Shui-ching-chu*, I cannot do better than refer to the study of R. STEIN.[1] I think we can accept for practical purposes his average of 400 metres.

8. Kuo I-kung says that west of Wu-chʻa 烏秅 there is the country of the Hanging Passages. It is a mountain gorge which is impassable; only by drawing out ropes one may cross it; hence the country has received its name. The natives dwell in the mountains. They cultivate [their fields] between stone walls. Heaped rocks are employed for building houses. The people join their hands for drinking; it is what we call monkey drinking. They have white goats[2] and short-stepping horses. They have donkeys, but no oxen.

Another quotation from Kuo I-kung is given by Ma Kuo-han: " In the Hanging Passages the tombs are in the dwelling huts. [The traveller] enters a stretch of about ten *li*, and [this] difficult crossing is the Hanging Passages. Once they are crossed, [the traveller] eventually reaches a plain of about 100 *li*. Its population is not different [from that on the other side of the Passages?]".[3] The plain of 100 *li* below the Hanging Passages must be the valley of Gilgit. It cannot well be defined as a plain, but it is the greatest widening in the Indus valley between Baltistan and the Panjab.

Wu-chʻa, ancient *·uo-d'ʻa*, corresponds to an original *Uḍa.[4] According to HERRMANN, it is to be situated in Sarikol, south of Yarkand.[5]

1) *Le Lin-yi*, pp. 11-12.

2) ST, SW and SY have 白草 "white grass" which seems out of place here I have followed SS (白羊).

3) *Yü-han-shan-fang-chi-i-shu*, *Kuang-chih*, ch. 上, f. 1 *a-b*.

4) PELLIOT, *A propos du Tokharien*, in TP, XXXII (1936), pp. 276-279.

5) *Southern Tibet*, vol. VIII, pp. 19 and 451. It is certanly not synonimous with Wu-chʻang (Uḍḍiyāna), as maintained by LÜDERS, Pali *uddiyāna*, in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, IL (1920), pp. 235-236 (= *Philologica Indica*, Göttingen, 1940, p. 496).

The "short-stepping" of the text refers, according to FRANKE, to the ambling gait of the Central Asian and Pamir ponies.

9. These are those Hanging Passages, of which the monk Fa-hsien also says that after having crossed the river he arrived to the country of Wu-ch'ang 烏長 (Uḍḍiyāna). The kingdom of Wu-ch'ang is [a part of] northernmost India. It is a kingdom where the Buddha arrived. The Buddha left the mark of his foot in it. The mark is long or short according to the faith of the man
6 a [who beholds it]. Up to now it still exists. Also the stone, where [the Buddha] dried his robe, is still in existence.

This is an abstract of the first two paragraphs in Fa-hsien's ch. 8 (LEGGE, pp. 28-29).

The stone showing the footprint of the Buddha, with the Kharoṣṭhi inscription *Bodhasa Śakamuṇisa padaṇi* (foot-prints of the Buddha Śākyamuni), was seen and photographed by Sir Aurel Stein near the village of Tirat in Upper Swat, about long. $72^{\circ}30'$, lat. $35^{\circ}7'30''$. Also the boulder on which the Buddha dried his robe, is still extant on the right bank of the Swat river, four miles south of Tirat.[1]

10. a) The river Indus further flows towards the south-west; then it bends and flows to the south-east. It passes through Central India.

b) On both banks there is level country. There is a kingdom called P'i-ch'a 毗荼,[2] where the law of the Buddha is flourishing.

c) [The pilgrim] continued following the P'u-na-pan 蒲那般[3] river. On the banks of the river to the right and left there are twenty *saṅghārāma*.

d) This river flows through the kingdom of Mo-t'ou-lo 摩頭羅 (Mathurā) and joins below it the river Indus. From this river to Western India there are many kingdoms.

1) Sir Aurel STEIN, *Archaeological tour in Upper Swat and adjunct hill tracts* (MASI, n. 42), Calcutta, 1930, pp. 55-56, 59-61. For the inscription there see STEN KONOW, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, II-I, pp. 8-9.

2) Or P'i-t'u; the second character has both pronounciations.

3) SS has Man- 滿. Fa-hsien (*Taishō*, LI, 859 *a*) has P'u-na 蒲那.

e) From here to the south all [the country] is Madhyadeśa (中國). Its people are rich.

f) The inhabitants of Madhyadeśa dress and eat like the Middle Kingdom (中國); therefore they are called Madhyadeśa.

g) Since the *parinirvāṇa* [of the Buddha], the forms of ceremony, laws and rules practised by the holy communities, have been handed down from one generation to the other without interruption. From the river Indus to the regions of Southern India and on to the Southern Sea, there are 40.000 *li*.

This paragraph is the worst confused in our text. It consists of some isolated passages from Fa-hsien; the connecting text seems to be due to Li Tao-yüan and is mostly a string of mistakes and misunderstandings.

The chapters of Fa-hsien, from which this text is culled, describe with sufficient clearness the pilgrim's departure from Bannu, his crossing of the Indus, his journey to P'i-ch'a and along the P'u-na-pan river; then they give an account of the principal features and customs of Northern India.

The following passages in our text are from Fa-hsien:

b) = last sentence of ch. 14 and first of ch. 15 (LEGGE, p. 41);

c) = beginning of ch. 16 (LEGGE, p. 42);

e) = beginning of second paragraph of ch. 16 (LEGGE, p. 42);

g) = end of ch. 16 (LEGGE, p. 47).

The connecting text begins (**a**) with twisting the Indus towards the south-east and sending it to Central India, i. e., in the language of the Buddhist pilgrims, the Ganges valley. Then (**d**) it consequently goes on calling the Ganges by the name Sindhu, and makes the P'u-na-pan, which cannot but be the Jumna, join it below Mo-t'ou-lo; this last is of course Mathura, and its mention here is due to a reminiscence from Fa-hsien.

The mistake probably goes back to texts employing the word *sindhu* in its widest acception, that of "great river". It is, however, peculiar that just below (§ 9) a quotation from the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* describes the exact course of the Indus. In (f) Li Tao-yüan gives a rather unhappy explanation of the word Chung-kuo, which is the translation of the Sanskrit Madhyadeśa and at the same time a name for China; it is partly based on a statement of Fa-hsien.[1]

The geographical names in this paragraph are all taken from Fa-hsien. P'i-ch'a (ancient *b'ji-d''a*) transcribes regularly *Bhiḍa. According to CUNNINGHAM,[2] it is Bhira or Bhera, on the bank of the Jhelam in the Shahpur district of West Panjab. The modern town, built by Sher Shah about 1540, is on the left bank of the river, but "Old Bhera, as it is still locally known, is represented by a large debris-covered mound situated to the north of the village of Ahmadabad close to the hamlet of Sardarkot and about 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles across the river from Bhera".[3] The identification can hardly be doubted; it is, however, strange that the name Bhera or Bhiḍa does not occur in inscriptions and that there is no trace of a kingdom of Bhiḍa in Indian tradition.

P'u-na-pan (ancient *b'uo-nâ-puân*) is evidently the Yamunā, but the phonetic equivalence is obscure. Discussing the P'u-na of Fa-hsien, Weller suggested an alternance *b-m* in the first syllable similar to Bombay-Mumbay; he quoted some (highly suspect) reconstructions by De Groot and Schlegel in support to his contention. According to him, *b'uo-nâ* transcribes (Ya)

1) Beginning of ch. 8 (LEGGE, p. 28).

2) *Ancient Geography of India*, Calcutta, 1924, pp. 177-178.

3) A. STEIN, *Archaeological Reconnaissances in North-Western India and South-Eastern Iran*, London, 1937, p. 59.

munā.[1] But our P'u-na-pan, of which P'u-na is evidently only a shortened form, precludes this reconstruction. The name remains as unexplained today as it was in LEGGE's time.

11. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that the river Indus flows through Chi-pin, Chien-yüeh 犍 越, Mo-ho-la 摩 訶 剌,[2] all these kingdoms, and enters the Southern Sea; so it is.

The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* is a Buddhist work, so Chi-pin probably means here Kashmir. This is of course wrong, as the Indus does not flow through Kashmir proper, but the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* is accustomed to take liberties with hydrography.

Concerning Chien-yüeh, its second character (ancient *ji̯ʷvt*) is found fairly often at the end of Indian geographical names in the Chinese texts. As rightly pointed out by S. LÉVI, *yüeh* is a sort of vague geographical exponent; it originally represented the final suffix *°vatī*, quite frequent in Indian geographical names, and was later extended even to names of which *°vatī* was no part.[3] *Chien* is the first character (with a small modification) of Fa-hsien's Chien-t'o-wei 建 陀 衞. Chien-yüeh is therefore Gandhāra.

The ancient pronounciation of Mo-ho-la was *muâ-χâ-lât*, which regularly corresponds to a form *Mahārāṭ. I know of no ethnical name in this area (middle Indus) that can be brought into relation with this, unless it be the highly doubtful Mahārāja Janapada, a tribal state the existence of which was inferred by K. P. JAYASWAL from a mention in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini (4, 3, 97) and from some coins of the 2nd century A. D. found

1) F. WELLER, *Kleine Beiträge zur Erklärung Fa-hsiens*, in *Asia Major, Hirth Anniversary Volume*, London, 1923, pp. 562-563.
2) SS: | 河 | .
3) LÉVI, *Le catalogue des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī*, in J. As., 1915¹, p. 60.

in the Panjab.[1] But the reading *Mahārājajanapadasa* on these coins is definitely wrong,[2] and the data of Pāṇini may be interpreted otherwise. Unless no other evidence is forthcoming, we cannot identify this phantom tribe with our *Mahārāṭ. But no other suggestion can be made at the moment.

6 b **12.** To the south-west of the A-nou-ta mountain there is the river called Yao-nu 遙奴. To the south-west of the mountain, somewhat to the east, there is the river called Sa-han 薩罕. A little more to the east there is the river called Heng-chia 恒伽 (Ganges). These three rivers issue together from the same mountain. All of them enter the river Heng 恒 (Ganges).

After having described the Indus, the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* takes up again the list of rivers issuing from the Anavatapta.

HERRMANN has equated Yao-nu with the Karnali and Sahan with the Sarda, wisely accompanying this tentative identification with a query.[3] I think he was only half right.

We have here three rivers, all of them issuing from the Anavatapta at a small distance from each other, and later uniting to form, or at least flowing into, the Ganges. The first great river which one comes across while travelling from the basin of the Indus to that of the Ganges, is the Jumna. The ancient pronounciation of Yao-nu is *i̯äu-nuo*, and the transcription value of these two characters in the 6th century was *yau* and *nā/no*.[4] I take this to be the transcription of some Prakrit form of Yamunā with attenuated nasal, e. g. something like the Ardhamagadhī जँउणा or the form transcribed by al-Berūnī as Jaun.

1) K. P. JAYASWAL, *Hindu Polity*, Calcutta, 1924, vol. I, p. 159.

2) The correct reading is *Rajañajanapadasa*; J. ALLAN, *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India* [*in the British Museum*], London, 1936, p. civ.

3) HERRMANN, *Die Westländer* etc., p. 241.

4) LÉVI, *Le catalogue des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī*, pp. 133 and 128.

Sa-han must have exchanged places, by an error of the text or otherwise, with the Ganges; no large river exists between Jumna and Ganges, and the Sa-han must be looked for to the east of the Ganges. The second character *han* 罕 is an obvious error for *yü* 宇. The ancient pronounciation of the name is *sât-jịu*, which transcribes Sar(a)yū; it is the modern Sarda and its prolongation, the lower Gogra.

13. The *Fu-nan-chuan* of K ang T'ai says that the source of the river Ganges (Heng) issues, on the farthest north-west, from the K'un-lun. In the middle of the mountain there are five great sources; all the rivers flow separated, but all of them issue from these five great sources. The great river Chih-hu-li 枝扈黎 issues from the north-west of the mountain, flows towards the southeast and empties itself in the ocean. The Chih-hu-li is therefore the Ganges itself.

K'ang T'ai's five rivers are those of the Buddhist canonical tradition: Gangā, Yamunā, Sarabhū, Aciravatī, Mahī.[1]

Chih (枝)-hu-li is a wrong spelling of Pa (扳)-hu-li, which is found in the already quoted passage of the *Kua-ti-chih*,[2] as another name for the Ganges. The first two syllables of Pa-hu-li (ancient *b'at-γuo-liei*) seem to transcribe a Sanskrit *valgu*, while the last cannot be explained at present. *Valgu* often occurs in Sanskrit for *phalgu*, and the river here meant is the Phalgumatī, Vaggumudā of the Pali texts, alias Aciravatī or Revatī, the modern Rapti. The identification of the Phalgumatī with the Ganges is of course a mistake by K'ang T'ai, who misunderstood his Indian informants; his account forms the basis of both the texts of the *Shui-ching-chu* and the *Kua-ti-chih*.

1) See back pp. 13-14.

2) The equation Pa-hu(-li) = Valgu was first tentatively suggested by PELLIOT, *Autour d'une traduction sanskrite du Tao-tö-king*, in TP, XIII (1912), p. 355 *n*.

14. Accordingly, the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* has a list of the bends of the Ganges. To the north of the Ganges there are four kingdoms. Westernmost is the one between the bends of the Indus and of the Ganges. It is the kingdom of Chü-i-na-ho 拘夷那褐 (Kuśinägara).

The distortion of the geographic picture of India in the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* is particularly evident here. The four kingdoms are Kuśinägara, Vaiśālī (see § 19), Saṅkāśya (see § 23) and Kapilavastu (see § 29). They are not described in any order, nor is Kuśinägara the westernmost of the four. All of them are hundreds of miles away from the Satlej-Jumna doab in the Panjab.

15. The *Fa-hsien-chuan* says that the river Ganges flows towards the south-east, to the south of the kingdom of Kuśinägara. [There is a place] to the north of the city, between two trees, on the river Hsi-lien-ch'an 希連禪 (Hiraṇyavatī). Here, on the banks of the river, is the place where the Bhagavan, with his head to the north, performed his *parinirvāṇa*, and where his relics were divided.

Except for the first sentence, this para is a quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 24 (LEGGE, pp. 70-71). In Hsi-lien-ch'an, the last character should be disregarded, as it is due to the attraction of Ni-lien-ch'an (the Nairañjanā river near Bodh Gaya); the confusion between the two rivers was very common.[1]

16. The *Wai-kuo-shih* of Chih Sêng-tsai says that after the *parinirvāṇa* of
7 a the Buddha the Devas | wrapped the Buddha into new white pieces of cloth and made offerings to him with scented flowers. When seven days were completed, they took him out of the royal palace in a golden coffin and brought him beyond a small river. The name of the river was Hsi-lan-na 醯蘭那 (Hiraṇya). At about three *li* from the royal palace and to the north of it, [they built a funeral pile] employing sandal wood as fuel. The Devas tried severally to ignite the pile, but it did not burn. Mahā-Kaśyapa (大迦葉) came back from Liu-sha 流沙, sobbed most vehemently and moved heaven and earth to compassion.

1) S. LÉVI, *La mission de Wang Hiuen-ts'e dans l'Inde*, in J. As., 1900[II], p. 324.

Then after this, other fuel, though unkindled, took fire by itself. The kings wanted relics. They measured [the ashes] with gold bushels, and obtained eight *droṇa* and four pecks. All the kings, and the lords of the gods, of the Nāga and of the spirits, each of them took a little [of the ashes]. They carried it back to their own kingdoms, in order to build a temple of the Buddha over it. King Aśoka erected a stūpa on the place of the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. The two trees too received a stūpa, but this is no longer extant. The name of these trees was So-lo 娑羅 tree (*śāla*). The flowers of these trees are called So-lo-ch'ia 娑羅佉 (*śālaka*). The colour of these flowers is white like hoarfrost or snow, and its perfume is matchless.

The traditional accounts of the death and cremation of the Buddha grew up from simple beginnings to the legendary tales of later texts. See on this subject the exhaustive study of WALDSCHMIDT, *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha* (Abh. Ak. Wiss. Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., III series, nn. 29, 30), Göttingen, 1944-48. Also PRZYLUSKI, *Le Parinirvāṇa et les funerailles du Buddha*, in J. As., 1918, 1919 and 1920.

There is nothing distinctive about Chih Sêng-tsai's account; it follows the standard version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*; in some particulars, such as the starting of the funeral procession from inside the town and not from the place of death, it follows the version of Po Fa-tsu.[1]

Hsi-lan-na (ancient *χiei-lân-nâ*) transcribes more exactly a Prakrit form Hiraññа.

For the location of the cremation ground, the *Wai-kuo-shih* agrees with Hsüan-tsang, who also places the cremation stūpa to the north of the city, about 300 paces on the other side of the river.[2]

The name Liu-sha, meaning shifting sands and usually applied in Chinese texts to the Central Asian desert, remains

1) WALDSCHMIDT, *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha*, pp. 275, 283.
2) WATTERS, vol. II, pp. 39-40.

unexplained. According to most of the texts, Mahā-Kaśyapa was coming from Pāpā (Pāvā) to Kuśināgara, when he heard of the decease of the Buddha; according to Fa-hsien's version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, he was at Dakṣiṇagiri, south of Rāja-gṛha; according to the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṅghika, followed by the *Mahāvastu*, he was on the Gṛdhrakūṭa.[1] In no canonical text anything is found which may recall our Liu-sha.

7 b 17. The *Fu-nan-chi* of Chu-chih says | that from the kingdom of Lin-yang 林楊 there is a land route of 2000 *li* to the kingdom of Chin-ch'ên 金陳. One may travel by cart or on horseback, but there is no water route. The whole kingdom honours the Buddha. They had a monk; when he died he was to be cremated. For the cremation more than one thousand faggots [were employed], but still he sat in the midst of the fire. So they took him out and placed him inside a stone building, and since that time for about sixty years the corpse remained as before, without being corrupted. Chu Chih saw it with his own eyes. That man still remains there intact like a diamond (*vajra*); clearly he will last forever. The *caitya* of his relics is visible and for all times[2] they are incor-rupted. His knowledge of Void, as they call it, was infinite. His great science was boundless.

The first three sentences of this passage have been translated by PELLIOT;[3] he also collected several other texts concerning Chin-ch'ên and Lin-yang. Lin-yang is still unexplained. On Chin-ch'ên the best study is that of S. LÉVI.[4] Chin-ch'ên is identical with Chin-lin 金隣 of other texts. They correspond to the Suvaṇṇabhūmi of the *Niddesa* and to the Suvarṇaku-ḍyaka of the *Harivaṃśa* and of Kṣemendra; *chin*, gold, translates

1) WALDSCHMIDT, op. cit., pp. 285-289.
2) Thus I translate the characters 畢天. Under their heading the *Pei-wên-yün-fu* 佩文韻府, Commercial Press edition, Shanghai, 1937, p. 654 *c* registers only the present quotation of the *Shui-ching-chu* and nothing more.
3) Le Fou-nan, in BEFEO, III (1903), p. 267.
4) *Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Bṛhatkathā*, in *Études Asiatiques de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, Paris, 1926, vol. II, pp. 29-37.

Suvarṇa, and *chʻên* or *lin* (ancient *dʻi̯ĕn* and *li̯ĕn*) transcribes the syllable *ḍya.*[1] The location of this semi-legendary name cannot be ascertained with precision, because it was a floating geographical expression referring to countries to the east of the Gulf of Bengal. We may look for it in Lower Burma or in the Malayan Peninsula.[2]

Li Tao-yüan apparently inserted here this paragraph because of some vague ressemblance with the funerals of the Buddha. But Chu Chih's account refers to some other personage; it is perhaps the echo of a local legend concerning some famous monk, which he heard from the Indian traders.

18. This river flowing with many vagaries runs into the Ganges. The Ganges again flows eastward, to the north of the city of Pʻi-shê-li 毗舍利 (Vaiśālī).

" This river " is again the Hiraṇyavatī (Gandak).

19. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that Pʻi-shê-li is the kingdom of Wei-hsieh-li 維邪離 (Vaiśālī).

20. The *Wai-kuo-shih* of Chih Sêng-tsai says that from the kingdom of Wei-hsieh-li there are 50 *yojana* to the city of Wang-shê 王舍 (Rājagṛha). The city has a perimeter of three *yojana*. The house of Wei-chʻieh 維詰 (Vimalakīrti)
8 a is to the south of the palace inside the great enceinte, | at a distance of 7 *li* from the palace. The building is destroyed and one can see only the place where it stood.

This passage has been translated by PELLIOT, *Autour d'une traduction sanskrite du Tao-tö-king*, in TP, XIII (1912), p. 382 *n.*

1) LÉVI, op. cit., p. 36.

2) See also LUCE, *Countries neighbouring Burma*, in *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, XIV (1924), pp. 151-158. Suvarṇakuḍya of the Kauṭalīya *Arthaśāstra* seems to be rather located in Assam. See N. N. DAS GUPTA, *Karṇasuvarṇa and Suvarṇakuḍya*, in *Indian Culture*, V (1938-9), pp. 339-341.

The *yojana* is not used as a measure of length in the accounts of the Chinese pilgrims, with the exception of Fa-hsien's, where it alternates with the *li*. This fact has been studied by WELLER; he concluded that short distances in *li* mean travel on the state trunk roads, where distances were officially marked.[1] It is of course difficult to say whether this interesting result applies also to the present passage of the *Wai-kuo-shih*; many more quotations than this single one would be required for reaching a reliable conclusion.

The value of the *yojana* is of 4 *krośa* or 40 *li*.[2] Starting from a *li* of 400 metres, we may attribute to the *yojana* of Fa-hsien and of the *Wai-kuo-shih* an average of 16 km.

A perimeter of three *yojana*, i. e. 120 *li* seems much exaggerated for a place like Vaiśālī. According to Hsüan-tsang the city measured 60 or 70 *li* in circuit, and the citadel only 4 or 5 *li*.[3]

In this text we have the first mention of that famous building, the house of Vimalakīrti, which was the scene of the " explanation of Vimalakīrti ".[4] The house is not yet mentioned by Fa-hsien. A century later Hsüan-tsang was to give an account of it [5] and the Chinese envoy Wang Hsüan-ts'ê was to measure its dimensions.[6] The precise indication of the *Wai-kuo-shih* may perhaps help to find the site of the building. But there are

1) WELLER, *Yojana und li bei Fa-hsien*, in ZDMG, 1920, pp. 225-237.

2) S. LÉVI, *Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyana*, in J. As., 1918[1], pp. 153-160. In a passage of the *Wai-kuo-shih* quoted in the *Yüan-chien-lei-han*, ch. 316, f. 2 *a*, we have the clear statement " the *yojana*, that is in Chinese 40 *li* ".

3) WATTERS, vol. II, p. 63.

4) The *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasutra* is preserved in three Chinese, a Tibetan and a fragmentary Soghdian version. See the bibliography in LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 516-517 *n*.

5) WATTERS, vol. II, pp. 66-68.

6) S. LÉVI, *La mission de Wang Hiuen-ts'e dans l'Inde*, pp. 315-316.

conflicting statements on the subject. Another quotation from the *Wai-kuo-shih* says that the house of Vimalakīrti was inside the town and that its foundations were still to be seen.[1] The *Fo-tsung-t'ung-chi* places it to the north-east of Vaiśālī.[2]

21. The monk Fa-hsien says that to the north of the city there is a large grove and [a shrine in] two sections where the Buddha once dwelt. Originally the woman Yen-p'o-lo 菴婆羅 (Āmrapālī) and her family had presented it to the Buddha and built a *vihāra* in it.

This para is a quotation from the beginning of Fa-hsien's ch. 25 (LEGGE, p. 72).

22. Three *li* to the north-west of the city there is a stūpa called "bows and weapons discarded", etc. [*omitted*].

Then follows the legend of the thousand princes, as related in Fa-hsien's ch. 25 (LEGGE, pp. 73-74).

9 *a* **23.** The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that inside the bend of the Ganges next to the east there is the city of Sêng-chia-shan-nai-chieh 僧迦扇奈揭 (Saṅkāśyanāgara). The Buddha descended to this kingdom by the three flights of precious steps.

Contents parallel to the following. Saṅkāśya is now Sankisa in the Farrukhabad district. For the archaeological remains there see HIRANAND SHASTRI, *Excavations at Sankisa*, in *Journal of the U. P. Historical Society*, III (1927), pp. 99-118.

24. The *Fa-hsien-chuan* says that the river Ganges flows south-eastward, to the south of the kingdom of Sêng-chia-shih 僧迦施 (Saṅkāśya). It is the place where the Buddha descended from the Trayastriṃśa heaven towards the

1) *Yüan-chien-lei-han*, ch. 316, f. 2 *a*.

2) CHAVANNES, *Les inscriptions chinoises de Bodh-Gaya*, in *Révue d'histoire des religions*, 1896, p. 28.

east by three flights of precious steps, after having preached the Law to his mother. The precious steps then disappeared in the ground. King Aśoka built a stūpa on the place of the precious steps. Then he erected a stone pillar; upon the pillar he placed the image of a lion. When some heterodox teachers showed little faith, the lion roared; as an effect of the fright their hearts grew sincere.

This is an abridgement of the account in Fa-hsien's ch. 17 (LEGGE, pp. 47-50).

25. The river Ganges again flows eastward to the city of Chi-pin-jao-i 罽賓饒夷 (Kanauj). The city touches on the south the river Ganges. Six or seven *li* to the north-west of the city, on the northern bank of the river Ganges, is the place where the Buddha preached the Law to all his disciples.

Except for the words " the river Ganges again flows eastward to ", the whole paragraph is an abridged quotation of the first half of Fa-hsien's ch. 18 (LEGGE, p. 54). Chi-pin-jao-i is an error for Fa-hsien's Chi-jao-i (ancient *kiăi-ńźi̯ău-(ź)i*, transcribing a Prakrit *Kanjauj); it is due to the attraction of the name Chi-pin, much better known in China at that time.

The *Shui-ching-chu* has also the addition of the word " south "; it is missing in Fa-hsien, who simply says that the city " lies along the Ganges ". Thus according to the text of the *Shui-ching-chu* Kanauj is to the north of the Ganges; according to Hsüan-tsang it is to the west of the river.[1] Both are wrong, as the town is, and has always been, to the south by west of the Ganges. Fa-hsien is also very clear on this subject, as he tells us that he crossed the Ganges to go from Kanauj to Sāketa; and in the 10th century the pilgrim Chi-yeh gives us the correct bearings.[2]

1) WATTERS, vol. I, pp. 340-342.
2) HUBER, *L'itinéraire du pélerin Ki ye dans l'Inde*, in BEFEO, II (1902), p. 257.

26. The river Ganges again flows south-eastward, to the north of the kingdom of Sha-chih 沙祇 (Sāketa). If one goes out of the city of Sāketa by the southern gate, on the east of the road is where the Buddha, after having chewed his willow branch, stuck it in the ground; it grew seven feet, without increasing
9 b nor diminishing. And now it is still there.

Quoted from the first part of Fa-hsien's ch. 19 (LEGGE, pp. 54-55).

27. The river Ganges again flows south-eastward, to the north of the city of Chia-wei-lo-wei 迦維羅衛 (Kapilavastu). Formerly it was the capital of king Śuddhodana. Fifty *li* east of the city there was a royal park. The park had ponds and streams. The queen entered a pond and bathed. When she came out on its northern bank, after walking twenty paces, she put out her hand towards the east and grasped a tree; there she gave birth to the prince. When the prince fell to the ground, he walked seven paces. Two Nāgas squirted water to wash the prince. Then a well appeared there, and this is where all the monks draw their drinking water from.

Except for the first two sentences, the whole paragraph is a quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 22 (LEGGE, p. 67).

Chia-wei-lo-wei (ancient *ka-ʷi-lâ-jịʷäi*) is more exactly the transcription of a Prakrit form *Kavilavāī, from an earlier *Kapilavādī, corresponding to Sanskrit Kapilavatī.[1]

28. The prince, in company of Nan-t'o 難陀 (Nanda) and others, tossed away an elephant. Trying his hand at a contest, he shot an arrow which entered the ground; now a spring is there, which serves as drinking-well for travellers.

This paragraph is a quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 22 (LEGGE, pp. 65-66).

1) See e. g. PELLIOT, *Les noms propres du Milindapañha*, in J. As., 1914[II], p. 401 *n*. BAILEY, *Gandhari*, in BSOS, XI (1946), p. 786, derives it from a Gandhari Prakrit form *Kavilavas; but PELLIOT's theory seems to account better for the phonetic facts.

29. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that three *li* to the north of the city, by the river Ganges, there is the spot where the father king accepted the Buddha [as his son]. They have built a temple and placed in it an image of the father clasping the Buddha to his bosom.

This piece of information is quite new; neither Fa-hsien nor Hsüan-tsang mention this temple and statue. It is one item more which should be kept in mind by the future excavator of Kapilavastu.

Ganges is of course a mistake for Hiraṇyavatī.

30. The *Wai-kuo-shih* says that

The following long quotation is a most interesting description of Kapilavastu and of the journey of prince Siddhārtha to Rājagṛha and Bodh-Gaya. Its great importance may be realized if one thinks that it is completely independent of Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang, hitherto our only sources on the topography of the birthplace of the Buddha.

a) the kingdom of Chia-wei-lo-yüeh 迦維羅越 (Kapilavastu) has not got a king now. The city and the ponds are desert and dirty, and there is only the empty space. There are some *upāsaka*, about twenty households of the Śākya
10a family; they are the posterity of king Śuddhodana. Once they formed four families who dwelt inside the old city and acted as *upāsaka*; formerly they highly cultivated religious energy (*vīrya*) and still maintained the old spirit. In those days, when the stūpas were dilapidated, they completely repaired them.[1] The king [of Kapilavastu], over and above this, took care of one stūpa, and the king of Ssŭ-ho-t'iao 私訶條 sent gifts as an aid to finish it. But now there are [only] twelve monks who dwell inside that [city].

Of this section there is a parallel text in the *Yüan-chien-lei-han*, ch. 316, f. 2 *a*, which runs thus: "It (the *Wai-kuo-shih*) also

1) All the editions have 盡條; but the correction 盡修, which was kindly suggested to me by Professor Duyvendak, seems necessary.

says that the kingdom of Chia-wei-lo-yüeh is now subject to the kingdom of Po-li-yüeh 播黎越. There are also some *upā-saka* of the Śākya clan, about 20 families. They are the posterity of king Śuddhodana".

In the 4th century A. D. Kapilavastu was subject to Magadha, so it is practically certain that Po-li-yüeh (ancient *puâ-liei-ji̯ʷvt*) corresponds to Magadha. Phonetically, if we disregard the usual geographical exponent *yüeh* (°*vatī*), it may be explained as a shortened transcription of Pāṭaliputra. We are reminded of the Palibothra or Palimbothra of the Greek sources and of Fa-hsien's Pa-lien-fu, the original of which was also characterised by the loss of the dental in the second syllable. The phonetic similarity with Po-li of § 52 is apparently merely casual, as the characters are quite different.

Concerning the Śākya *upāsakas* in the ruins of Kapilavastu, who are mentioned in our text only, ST has a note quoting the *Mātaṅgīsūtra*. There are four versions of this text in the Canon (*Taishō*, XIV, nn. 551, 552; XXI, nn. 1300, 1301; *Nanjiō*, nn. 643-646), but none of them seems to contain anything bearing on this tale.

Ssŭ-ho-t'iao (ancient *si-χâ-d'i̯eu*) is a regular transcription of Sīhadiu, a Prakrit (not Pāli) form of the Sanskrit Siṃhadvīpa, i. e. Ceylon. The passage of the *Wai-kuo-shih* quoted in the *Yüan-chien-lei-han* gives a short description of Ssŭ-ho-t'iao; it is mostly limited to the Buddhistic relics there, foremost among them the four footmarks of the Buddha, which are also mention-ed by Fa-hsien in his description of Ceylon. Ssŭ-ho-t'iao is therefore to be kept strictly apart from Ssŭ-t'iao 斯調 of the *I-wu-chih* 異物志 [1] and of the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* and *Lo-yang-*

1) Quotations in LAUFER, *Asbestos and Salamander*, in TP, XVI (1915), pp. 351, 373.

chia-lan-chi 洛陽伽藍記.[1] It has been convincingly shown by FERRAND that Ssŭ-tʻiao is simply a wrong spelling for Ye-tʻiao, Java, as shown by its connection with the Mountains of Fire (volcanoes) and with the typically Javanese fruit måjå.[2]

We know of Singhalese foundations in Bodh-Gaya, but this mention of a Singhalese pious gift in Kapilavastu stands isolated.

b) The marvelous tree, which the excellent queen grasped when the Buddha came to life, is called *hsü-ko* 須訶 (*aśoka*). King Aśoka made, out of lapislazuli, a statue of the queen in the act of grasping [the tree] and giving birth to the prince. When the old tree had no more offshoots, all the *śramaṇa* took the old trunk and planted it; and over and over again it continued itself till the present time. The branches of the tree are as of old, and they still shelter the stone statue.

The tree grew in the Lumbinī garden, now Rummindei in the Nepalese Terai. It is known that Aśoka erected a pillar there, which is still standing, although broken. Aśoka's original statue (of which this is the only mention) is no longer extant, but the local temple still preserves an ancient sculpture representing the nativity of the Buddha,[3] which may be a copy of that of Aśoka.

c) Also the outlines of the marks of where the prince walked seven steps, are still preserved today. King Aśoka enclosed the marks with lapislazuli on both sides, and again had them covered over with one long slab of lapislazuli. The people of the country continuously make offerings to them with sweet-
10*b* smelling flowers. One still sees clearly the outlines of seven foot-prints; | although

1) Quotations in PELLIOT, *Deux itinéraires* etc., in BEFEO, IV (1904), p. 357 n and CHAVANNES, in J. As., 1903^{II}, p. 531.

2) FERRAND, *Ye-tiao, Sseu-tiao et Java*, in J. As., 1916^{II}, pp. 521-532. I could not consult the study of TOYOHACHI FUJITA on Ye-tʻiao, Ssŭ-tʻiao and Ssŭ-ho-tʻiao, in *Memoirs of the Faculty of Literature and Politics, Taihoku Imperial University*, I, 1 (1929).

3) P. C. MUKHERJI, *Antiquities in the Tarai* (ASI Report vol. XXVI, Part I), Calcutta, 1901.

there is now a slab covering them, it makes no difference. And again, people may cover them thickly with several layers of heavy cotton (*karpāsa*) and fasten these on the chiseled stone; and yet, [the marks] shine through them and are even brighter than before.

According to the *Aśokāvadāna*, king Aśoka came to the place and prostrated himself before the seven footmarks.[1] But his encasing of them is mentioned nowhere else but here.

d) When the prince was born, the kings of the Nāgas came to the prince and, the one to the left and the other to the right, squirted water and bathed the prince. The one Nāga was seen to squirt cold water and the other warm water; [this water] produced two pools. Even nowadays the one is cold and the other is warm.

Cfr. Fa-hsien, ch. 22 (LEGGE, p. 67) and Hsüan-tsang (WATTERS, vol. II, p. 14).

e) The prince had not yet come out of the house. Then on the tenth day he came out, went to the royal field and sat under a *jambu* tree. The god of the tree honoured the prince with seven kinds of jewels, but the prince did not accept them. Then he meditated on his desire of leaving his home. The royal field is at one *krośa* (拘盧) from the palace; a *krośa* means in Chinese (晉) ten *li*.

Cfr. the *Aśokāvadāna* (PRZYLUSKI, pp. 253-254); the *Lalitavistara*, ed. Lefmann (Halle, 1902-08), vol. I, pp. 128-129; Fa-hsien, ch. 22 (LEGGE, p. 67); Hsüan-tsang (WATTERS, vol. II, pp. 7-8). According to Hsüan-tsang, the royal field was 40 *li* to the north-east of Kapilavastu.

f) The prince went out of his house on the fifteenth day of the third month. The four kings of the Devas came to meet him, and each of them grasped one foot of the horse. At the same time all the spirits and Devas from all sides

1) PRZYLUSKI, *La legende de l'empereur Açoka*, Paris, 1923, pp. 251-252.

> filled the sky and showered heavenly scented flowers. Then he arrived to the Ho-nan-mo-chʻiang 河南摩強 river and became a *śramaṇa* on the
> 11 a banks of this river. The river Ho-nan-mo-chʻiang is ten *yojana* to the north of Kapilavastu. This river is at thirty *yojana* from Lo-yüeh-chih 羅閱祇 (Rājagṛha), i. e. the kingdom of Pʻing-sha 瓶沙 (Bimbisāra). Then the Bodhisattva passed quickly through [Rājagṛha], and king Bimbisāra came out to see the Bodhisattva. The Bodhisattva stayed one day inside the Sui-lou-na 隨樓那 (Veluvana) grove of Bimbisāra. At sunset he then went to pass the night on the Pan-ta-po-chʻou 半達鉢愁 (Pāṇḍara-Parvata). Pan-ta means white in Chinese (晉); Po-chʻou means mountain in Chinese. The White Mountain is to the north, at a distance of ten *li* from the kingdom of Bimbisāra. At sunrise he started at once; at evening he took his night rest on the hill Tʻan-lan 曇蘭 which is at six *yojana* from the White Mountain. Then he arrived straight to the *pei-to* 貝多 tree. The *pei-to* tree is to the north of Yüeh-chih 閱祇,[1] at a distance of twenty *li* from the Tʻan-lan hill.

The journey from Kapilavastu to Rājagṛha shows a few particularities in respect of the canonical accounts.

The Ho-nan-mo-chʻiang river is the Anomā of the Pali text, the river where the Buddha took up the condition of a religious mendiant. *Ho* 河 is of course an error for *A-* 阿. The old pronounciation was *·â-nâm-muâ-g'ịang*, which seems rather to transcribe a Prakrit *Anamma-gaṅ(ga). According to the *Mahāvastu*, ed. Senart, Paris, 1882-1897, vol. II, p. 164, and to other texts, Anomiya is a city 12 *yojana* to the south of Kapilavastu. In any case the " north " of our text cannot be correct, because the Buddha went south-east on his route to Magadha.

According to the traditional account, the Buddha, after having passed through the city of Rājagṛha, went straight to the Pāṇḍava hill, where he was visited by king Bimbisāra and entreated in vain to accept one half of his kingdom. The Veluvana grove, instead, was presented by king Bimbisāra to the Buddha, when the latter came to Rājagṛha after having obtained

1) SS: Chʻüeh-chih 闕 | .

the *bodhi.* The *Wai-kuo-shih* seems to have confused two events. Sui-lou-na (ancient *zʷi̯e̯-l̯əu-nâ*) is an interesting transcription, probably derived through a Central Asian dialectal medium.[1]

Geographically speaking, Pan-ta-po-ch'ou corresponds to the Pāṇḍava-parvata of Buddhist tradition. But in our case the ancient pronounciation *puân-dʿat-puât-ḍẓʿi̯ə̯u* [2] and its meaning (White Hill) show that the Chinese translator had before him an original Pāṇḍara-parvata; this is a form used in the *Mahābhārata,* but very rare in Buddhist texts. Our text is important for settling the location of this famous hill. B. C. LAW has discussed the question basing himself on the Pali sources and on Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang; he identifies the Pāṇḍavaparvata with modern Vipulagiri, north - north-east of Rājagṛha.[3] The *Wai-kuo-shih* perfectly supports this result, which may be accepted as established.

Tʿan-lan (ancient *dʿâm-lân*) transcribes a Prakrit form Dhammārañña. A Dharmāraṇya is known from Brahmanical lore; it is mentioned in the *Vāyu-Purāṇa* and in the *Mahābhārata,* not as a hill, but as a tract of land; "it is, at least in part, no other sacred site than the precincts of the Bodh-Gaya temple representing the jungle of Uruvelā of Buddhist literature".[4] In the Buddhist tradition Dharmāraṇya is an hermitage where the Buddha betook himself after the Sermon of the Wild-deer Park; he was coming from the place of Uruvilvā-Kaśyapa and was

1) PELLIOT, *Pāpīyān > Po-siun,* in TP, XXX (1933), pp. 95-99. Our Sui-lou-na must be added to the several examples there quoted of *sui* transcribing a Prakrit *vi* or *ve.*

2) The last character is apparently corrupted, but I am unable to restore the correct one.

3) B. C. LAW, *Rājagṛha in ancient literature* (MASI, n. 58), Delhi, 1938, pp. 3-6, 28-30.

4) B. M. BARUA, *Gayā and Buddha-Gayā,* vol. I (Calcutta, 1934), pp. 16-17, 72.

going to the Ajapālanyagrodha.[1] But the name is not usually connected with the Buddha's journey to the tree of the six-years meditation, and nowhere in the texts is Dharmāraṇya represented as a hill. On the other side, there really was a hill, which according to tradition was the first place reached by the Buddha on his arrival to Bodh-Gaya: it was the Gayāśira or Gayāśīrṣa, which is "the rugged hill to the south of Gaya town, which rises some 400 feet above this town and is now known as the Brahmayoni hill".[2] Position and distance from Rājagṛha seem to fit quite well our T'an-lan. We may conclude that the *Wai-kuo-shih* has by mistake applied the name of the Dharmāraṇya hermitage to the Gayāśīrṣa hill.

Pei-to (ancient *puai-tâ*) is the palmyra tree (*Borassus flabellifera*), the leaves of which (Sanskrit *pattra*) were employed as writing material; the name *pattra* was erroneously applied by the Chinese to the tree.[3] In Chinese tradition the palmyra tree usually takes the place of the *aśvattha* (*Ficus religiosa*) of the Indian tradition as the tree under which the Buddha obtained the *bodhi*; this is the case, e. g., in Fa-hsien's ch. 31 (LEGGE, p. 88). But here it apparently stands for that *aśvattha* (*pippala*) tree under which the Buddha practised penance for six years; cfr. § 43.

Yüeh-chih seems an abbreviation of Lo-yüeh-chih, employed some lines above (as well as in Fa-hsien) for transliterating Rājagṛha. But this cannot possibly be correct, because the Bodhi

1) *Mahāvastu*, vol. III, pp. 434, 436.

2) B. M. BARUA, *Gaya and Buddha Gaya*, vol. I, p. 11.

3) This at least is the usual explanation; it takes *pei-to* as an abbreviation of *pei-to-lo* of later texts, which means undoubtedly *pattra*; see e. g. GILES, *Chinese-English Dictionary*, p. 1078. But I entertain a strong suspicion that in the case of early texts such as Fa-hsien and the *Wai-kuo-shih* the word *pei-to* may be independent of *pei-to-lo* and may simply transcribe the Sanskrit *vaṭa*, another name of the *nyagrodha* or *Ficus indica*.

tree is at Bodh Gaya, south of Gaya town. "North" must be corrected into "south", and Yüeh-chih stands for Bodh-Gaya; the text of the whole passage is much corrupted.

It may be noted that Chih Sêng-tsai employs the character *chin* 晉 for Chinese; this means that he lived in the times of the Chin dynasty (265-420).

g) The prince went out of his home at twenty-nine and obtained the *bodhi* at the age of thirty-five. This statement is different from the *sūtras*, and the records therefore do not agree.

This sentence is difficult to understand, as according to the universally accepted tradition the Buddha left his home at twenty-nine and obtained the *bodhi* at 35, just as stated by our text. Chu Mou-wei 朱謀㙔, a commentator of the Ming dynasty, who wrote in 1615, states that our text aims against the *P'u-yao-ching* 普曜經, i. e. the *Lalitavistara*, which (according to him) lets the Buddha depart from home at nineteen and obtain the *bodhi* at thirty.[1] But neither the Sanskrit text nor the Chinese translation [2] of the *Lalitavistara* make any mention of the age of the Buddha on these two occasions.

31. Chu Fa-wei says that the kingdom of Chia-wei-wei 迦維衛 (Kapilavastu) is the kingdom of India where the Buddha was born. It is the centre
11 *b* of 3000 suns and moons and of 12000 | heavens and earths.

32. The *Fu-nan-chuan* of K'ang T'ai says that formerly, in the times of Fan Chan 范旃 there was a man from the kingdom of T'an-yang 嘾楊 called Chia-hsiang-li 家翔梨. He went from his country to India, and stage by stage trading all the way he arrived in Fu-nan. He told [Fan] Chan of the Indian customs, the expansion of the [Buddhist] religion, the accumulation

1) SS, f. 13 *a*.
2) *Taishō*, vol. III, n. 186.

of wealth, the great fertility of the country, [so great that everybody could] follow his own desires; the great kingdoms on every side had honoured it for a long time. [Fan] Chan asked what was its distance and how far one must travel to reach it. [Chia-hsiang]-Li said: "India may be at more than 30.000 *li* from here; to go and return, three years and more are required, and one may take even four years to return thence. It is considered the centre of heaven and earth".

This paragraph was translated and commented upon by PELLIOT, *Le Fou-nan*, pp. 277-278, to whom I beg to refer.

Fan Chan was a king of Fu-nan, who reigned ca. 225-205 A. D.

33. The river Ganges again flows eastward to the Lan-mo 藍莫 (Rāma) stūpa. To the side of the stūpa there is a pond. Inside the pond a Nāga is keeping the watch. King Aśoka wished to destroy the stūpa and to build 84.000 new stūpas. But he became aware of what the king of the Nāgas used to offer, and recognized that such things could not be had anywhere; therefore he
12 a desisted. This place became empty and deserted, without inhabitants; but herds of elephants came to fetch water with their trunks and to squirt it on the earth. When green *Sterculia* grew together in quantity, the elephants ploughed and the crows weeded the soil.

Except for the last sentence, which is an embellishment of Li Tao-yüan, this paragraph is an abridged quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 23 (LEGGE, pp. 68-69). Fa-hsien's and Hsüan-tsang's [1] Rāmagrāma was at 200 *li* (km. 80) to the east of Kapilavastu. It is however to be noted that this Rāma is the product of a late legend, and the original Rāmagrāma of the oldest texts (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* etc.) was somewhere on the banks of the Ganges between Magadha and the country of the Vṛji.[2]

1) WATTERS, vol. II, p. 20.

2) PRZYLUSKI, *Le partage des reliques du Buddha*, in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, IV (1935-6), pp. 356-365.

34. The river Ganges again flows eastward to the confluence of five rivers. But the five rivers which meet here are not detailed. When Ānanda was going etc. [*omitted*].

There follows the account of the *parinirvāṇa* of Ānanda, copied with some slight abridgement from Fa-hsien's ch. 27 (LEGGE, pp. 75-77). The scene of the miraculous decease of the favorite disciple of the Buddha is on the Ganges, on the route between New Rājagṛha and Vaiśālī; the legend is related at length in the *Aśokāvadāna.*[1]

The five rivers are clearly real ones, and thus they cannot be put in relation with the five rivers of Buddhist cosmology. I am inclined to think that the " confluence of five rivers " does not indicate a single point (even if the text of the *Fa-hsien-chuan* gives the definite distance of four *yojana* from Vaiśālī), but that short stretch between Arrah and Patna where the Gogra, the Gandak, the Son and some smaller streams flow into the Ganges.

35. One *yojana* to the southern side of the river-crossing one arrives at the city of Pa-lien-fu 巴連弗 (Pāṭaliputra) in the kingdom of Mo-chieh-t'i
12b 摩竭提 (Magadha). The city is the capital which was ruled by king Aśoka, etc. [*omitted*].

There follows the description of Pāṭaliputra, which is an abridgement of Fa-hsien's ch. 27 (LEGGE, pp. 77-80). I may point out that Pa-lien-fu (ancient *pa-li̯än-pi̯uət*) transcribes the same Prakrit form *Pālimput(ra)[2] which appears in Megasthenes as Palimbothra.

1) PRZYLUSKI, *La legende de l'empereur Açoka*, pp. 337-340. For a sculptural representation of this legend see J. Ph. VOGEL, *Le parinirvāṇa d'Ānanda d'après un bas-relief gréco-bouddhique*, in BEFEO, V (1905), pp. 417-418.

2) This is more exact that the *Pāliputr(a) suggested by BAILEY, *Gandhari*, p. 784.

13 a **36.** The river Ganges again flows to the south-east, past a small isolated rocky hill. On the top of the hill there is a hut of stone. This hut of stone faces south, and in olden times the Buddha stayed in it. Śakra, king of the gods, questioned the Buddha on forty-two subjects, and the Buddha one by one traced the replies on the rock. The marks of his tracing are still extant.

This paragraph corresponds, with some abbreviations, to the first paragraph of Fa-hsien's ch. 28 (LEGGE, pp. 80-81).

The small hill is that near the modern city of Bihar.[1]

LEGGE (but not GILES) was in doubt whether the tracing was done by Śakra or by the Buddha; our text allows us to decide the question in favour of the Buddha.

This legend refers to the famous *Sūtra of the Forty-Two Sections*, which is traditionally considered as the earliest Buddhist text translated, or rather adapted, into Chinese by Kaśyapa Mātaṅga in 67 A. D.[2] The tradition here related by Fa-hsien is not drawn from the text itself of the sūtra, which merely states that the Buddha, questioned (apparently at Benares) by some bhikṣus on matters of doctrine and discipline, gave his reply in 42 points.

37. The river Ganges again flows westward to the New City of Rājagṛha; it is the one built by king A-shê-shih 阿闍世 (Ajataśatru); etc. [*omitted*].

There follows an abridgement of the second half of Fa-hsien's ch. 28 (LEGGE, pp. 81-82), describing Old Rājagṛha. In

1) B. C. LAW, *Rājagṛha in ancient literature*, p. 19.

2) See T'ANG YUNG-T'UNG, *The editions of the Ssŭ-shih-êrh-chang-ching*, in HJAS, I (1936), pp. 147-155. Translated in BEAL, *A catena of Buddhist scriptures from the Chinese*, London, 1871, pp. 188-203. The date of 67 A. D. is legendary, but the sūtra cannot be later than the middle of the 2nd century; MASPERO in BEFEO, X (1910), p. 97, and LÉVI, in J. As., 1911[1], p. 448.

connection with the last §§ it must be remembered that the Ganges here is no real river and has nothing to do with the places described; it is simply a tread in the narrative.

13 *b* **38.** [*Omitted*]. On this hill the peak is beautifully green and is pictu-
resque and imposing; it is the highest of all the five hills.

This paragraph is the legend of the Gṛdhrakūṭa hill, which forms the first part (as far as " hence comes the name of the hill of the Vulture Cavern") of Fa-hsien's ch. 29 (LEGGE, pp. 82-83).

39. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that the Gṛdhrakūṭa peak is to the northeast
of the city of Rājagṛha of A-nou-ta. Looking westward towards this hill, there
are two summits which rise at a distance of about 2-3 *li* from each other. On
the path between the two, vultures always dwell on this range. The inhabitants
14 *a* give to it the name of Ch'i-shê 耆闍 peak. In the Hu 胡 (Indian) language
Ch'i-shê means vulture.

This paragraph and the following are welcome additions to our knowledge of the famous hill Gṛdhrakūṭa.

The " Rājagṛha of A-nou-ta " is of course Old Rājagṛha. But the name of the Anavatapta is absolutely unexpected here. Still, there are faint traces extant of a connection of A-nou-ta with Rājagṛha in the Chinese Buddhist tradition. The lost *Hsi-yü-chih* of Tao-an (4th century A. D.), perhaps the oldest account of the West by a Chinese monk, said: " In the kingdom of Mo-ho-lai 摩訶賴 there is the mountain A-nou-ta; the city of Wang-shê (Rājagṛha) is on the south-eastern side of the mountain ".[1] Mo-ho-lai, ancient *muâ-χâ-lâi*, seems to be Magadha, although the transcription is very anomalous. Two and a half centuries later, Hsüan-tsang mentions on the north

1) *Yüan-chien-lei-han*, ch. 316, f. 2 *a*.

side of the south-west declivity of the Vipulagiri "500 hot springs, of which there remained at his time several scores, some cold and some tepid; the source of these springs was the Anavatapta Lake to the south of the Snowy Mountains, and the streams ran underground to this place".[1] Our text is much more definite than Tao-an and Hsüan-tsang, as it seems to employ the name Anavatapta to distinguish the Rājagṛha of Magadha from other cities of the same name. The exact value of this Anavatapta remains, however, uncertain.

The position of the Gṛdhrakūṭa is not yet settled. Rājagṛha is surrounded by a girth of hills, which now bear Jaina names; but the Pali texts mention a traditional list of five hills. CUNNINGHAM identified Gṛdhrakūṭa with modern Sailagiri;[2] MARSHALL identified it with Chhathagiri, east of Rājagṛha,[3] and his view has been followed in the Archaeological Survey's guide of Rajgir;[4] B. C. LAW after a long discussion concludes in favour of Udayagiri, south-east of Old Rājagṛha.[5]

The Pali texts may favour B. C. LAW's contention, but not so the Chinese sources. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* (4th-5th century) places the Gṛdhrakūṭa to the north-east of the town. Fa-hsien (5th century) merely states that he entered the valley of Rājagṛha from the northern gap and bore round the mountains to the south-west on a rising gradient of fifteen *li* till he arrived on the Gṛdhrakūṭa.[6] Hsüan-tsang (7th century) says that

1) WATTERS, vol. II, pp. 153-154.

2) *Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 534-535.

3) Rājagṛha and its remains, in ASIAR, 1905-6, pp. 90-93.

4) M. H. KURAISHI & A. GHOSH, *Guide to Rajgir*, Delhi, 1939. The map at the end of that booklet is most convenient for following the present discussion.

5) *Rājagṛha in ancient literature*, pp. 6, 8-9, 30-32.

6) LEGGE, pp. 82-83. Also the Chinese text (p. 862 *c*) has south-east. GILES's south-west (p. 50) is a mistake.

he went north-east 14 or 15 *li* to the Gṛdhrakūṭa, which is continuous with the south side of the north mountain.[1] Chi-yeh, who left for India in 966,[2] says: "To the north-east (of Rājagṛha) he ascended a great mountain. Following a winding path he arrived to the stūpa of Śāriputra. Near a stream is found the stūpa called "Descent from horse and march against the wind". Thence he traversed a gullet and arrived at the summit of a great hill where are a great stūpa and a temple. It is said that here the seven Buddhas (of past ages) preached the Law. To the north of this hill there is a plain where the stūpa of the birth of Śāriputra is found. One half of the northern mountain is called the Peak of Vultures. The city of Rājagṛha is at the foot of the hill".[3] Fa-hsien is too vague to be of any use, but the other three are in complete agreement. Hsüan-tsang's Northern Mountain is not the whole spur Vipulagiri-Ratnagiri-Chhathagiri, but only its northernmost part, Vipulagiri; only in this way it is possible to conciliate his statements that the Vulture Hill is to the north-east of the town and that it is contiguous with the south side of the Northern Mountain. From the unanimous agreement of the Chinese pilgrims, I conclude that Gṛdhrakūṭa must be sought for somewhere on Ratnagiri. On the maps the hill looks as terminating with two larger peaks and a smaller one; two of these must correspond to the two summits of the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chih*. Of course the question can only be determined on the spot and I must leave the archeologists to settle it finally.

1) WATTERS, vol. II, p. 151.

2) On this date see CHAVANNES, *Notes sinologiques*, I, in BEFEO, IV (1904), pp. 75-77.

3) HUBER, *L'itineraire du pélerin Ki-ye dans l'Inde*, in BEFEO, II (1902), p. 258. The very short account of Chi-yeh is as precise and accurate in its topography as that of Hsüan-tsang. It is a pity that it is usually overlooked in discussing moot points of ancient Indian geography.

"Looking westward towards this hill" means looking at Gṛdhrakūṭa from the plains on its eastern side.

Ch'i-shê, ancient *g'ji-ẑia*, transcribes *gijja*, the Pali and Prakrit form for the Sanskrit *gṛdhra*, vulture.

40. Also Chu Fa-wei says that the kingdom of Lo-yüeh-chih (Rājagṛha) has a mountain of divine vultures, which in the Indian language is called the Ch'i-shê peak. The mountain is of green rock, and the summit resembles a vulture. King Aśoka sent people to chisel out the rock, to insert artificially two feet at the two sides and to carve out and adjust its body. It can still be seen now; if one looks at it from a distance, it resembles the shape of a vulture. Therefore they call it hill of the divine vulture.

Chu Fa-wei's account implies that when the hill was already famous on account of its traditional connection with the Buddha, Aśoka caused it to be adjusted by stone-cutters in order to give it an aspect corresponding in some degree to its name. The two feet were probably hewn out of boulders and fastened to the rock by iron or stone spikes. No such artificially corrected hill-top has yet been noticed, nor it is likely that it shall ever be, as it must have been deeply corroded by the exposure to wind and rain during twenty-two centuries. Still, an investigation of the hill-tops to the east of Rājagṛha may bring yet some surprise.

41. Several accounts are in disagreement and the distances are different too. But here we adhere to Fa-hsien, who personally went to pass the night on this hill, recited the *Shou-lêng-yen* 首楞嚴 (*Śurāṅgama*) and made offerings of scented flowers, as to an authority for what he has seen and heard.

From the first sentence one may infer that already in the 5th century A. D. the location of the Gṛdhrakūṭa was no longer wholly certain.

The quotation is summarized from the last sentences of Fa-hsien's ch. 29 (LEGGE, pp. 83-84). It is not quite sure

whether this *Śurāṅgama* is the same as the *Śurāṅgamasamādhi* included in the Chinese Buddhist Canon,[1] as the former was revealed on the Gṛdhrakūṭa and the latter at Vaiśālī.

42. It flows again westward, to the south of the river of Chia-yeh 迦耶[2] (Gaya). [Going] thirty *li*, one arrives to the wooded place where the Buddha practised penance for six years; etc. [*omitted*].

There follows the description of the holy places of Bodh-Gaya, copied with some slight abbreviations from Fa-hsien's ch. 31 (LEGGE, pp. 87-89) (till " at all these places topes were reared ").

15*a* **43.** The *Wai-kuo-shih* speaks of the P'i-p'o-li 毗婆梨 (*pippala*) tree. The
Buddha stayed under that single tree for six years. The woman of a village
headman (辰者女) offered to the Buddha plentiful milk-gruel in a golden
bowl. The Buddha accepted the milk-gruel. He stood on the Ni-lien-ch'an
尼連禪 (Nairañjanā) river, took a bath, then on the river-bank he ate the
milk gruel; then he threw the bowl into the water. It floated against the current
15*b* for 100 paces, then the bowl sank in the river. The king of the Nāgas, Chia-
li-chiao 迦梨郊 (Kālika) took it into his palace and made offerings to it.
Previously there were three Buddha bowls to see.

The Buddha sat near the river under the Mahābodhi tree. The Mahābodhi tree is at a distance of two *li* from the *pei-to* tree. Under this tree for seven days he meditated on the Bodhi, and the hosts of Māra tempted the Buddha.

This paragraph is clearly the continuation of § 30. The *pippala* tree (*Ficus religiosa*) is the same as the *pei-to* tree of § 30 (f).

For the legend of Sujātā, the daughter of the village headman (*gṛhapati*), and of the Nāga king Kālika, see e. g. *Mahāvastu*, vol. I, pp. 263-265.

1) *Taishō*, n. 642. An abridged translation has been given by BEAL, *A catena of Buddhist scriptures from the Chinese*, pp. 284-369.

2) ST, SW and SY have Chia-na 迦那. I have followed SS.

With the distances given by our text and with Hsüan-tsang's description of the holy places at and near Bodh-Gaya, it should not be difficult to identify the emplacement of the tree under which the Buddha practised the six-years penance.[1]

44. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that the Ni-lien 尼連 (Nairañjanā) river flows to the south into the river Ganges. To the west of the river there is the tree of the Buddha. The Buddha in this place practised penance, and one day he ate the milk-gruel. To the west [of the tree] of the six years, there is a distance of five *li* from the city. To the east of the tree upon the stream is the place where the Buddha went to bathe. He ascended the bank to the east, and sat under the Ni-chü-lü 尼拘律 (*nyagrodha*) tree. The woman Hsiu-shê 脩舍 (Sujātā) offered him the gruel there. Then crossing the stream westwards, to the south of the tree of the six years, he sat under the *pei-to* tree. He defeated Māra and reached Buddhahood.

Also the distances and directions of the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* are new. It is interesting to note that it agrees with the *Lalita-vistara* in placing the bathing spot of the Buddha to the east of the theatre of his penances in Uruvela, while Fa-hsien places it to the west.

45. Fo-t'u-t'iao says that the Buddha tree was rotten at the core; put when [the Buddha] arrived there, it pushed out branches and leaves.

46. Chu Fa-wei says that the tree of the six years is at five *li* from the Buddha tree. We have written this differently.

In contrast with the two *li* of the *Wai-kuo-shih* (see § 43).

16 *a* **47.** After this, Fa-hsien went to the south-east back to Pāṭaliputra, followed the river Ganges descending towards the west, till he reached a *vihāra* called

1) The discussion by B. M. Barua, *Gaya and Buddha-Gaya*, vol. I, pp. 99-118 is not very illuminating.

"Wilderness" (曠野), where the Buddha had resided. Again following the river Ganges and descending towards the west, he reached the city of Po-lo-nai 波羅奈 (Benares) in the kingdom of Chia-shih 迦尸 (Kāśi).

This is a quotation from the first sentences of Fa-hsien's ch. 34 (LEGGE, pp. 93-94).

48. Chu Fa-wei says that the kingdom of Benares is 1200 *li* to the south of the kingdom of Chia-wei-lo-wei (Kapilavastu). Between them there is the river Ganges, which flows to the south-east. The place where the Buddha turned the Wheel of the Law is twenty *li* to the north of the kingdom. There is the tree called Chʻun-fou 春浮; it is the place of Wei-mo 維摩.

The Ganges does not flow between Benares and Kapilavastu, and there is probably a confusion with the Gogra.

The distance and direction of the Wild-Deer Park, where the Buddha first preached his law, is more exact than in Fa-hsien (see § 49). Sarnath is about 6½ kilometers due north of Benares.

In Chʻun-fou, the first character 春 is apparently a mistake for *yen* 奄. Yen-fou (ancient *·i̯ɒ̂m-bi̯ə̂u*) is the normal transcription of *jambu* (*Eugenia Jambolana*); but I do not think that the world-tree (*jambuvṛkṣa*) has anything to do here.

Wei-mo (ancient *ʷi-muâ*) transcribes *Vima. It is difficult to tell who is the personage meant here, but we may suppose that Chu Fa-wei refers to that man Vimala who, along with other three friend of Yaśas, was converted by the Buddha at Benares.[1] It is noteworthy that in the legend of Yaśas a *nyagrodha* tree plays a great part.[2]

1) See the *Abhiniṣkramaṇasutra* as translated by BEAL, *The romantic legend of Sakya Buddha*, London, 1875, pp. 266-267. Also MALALASEKERA, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, vol. II, pp. 686-687.

2) BEAL, op. cit., pp. 258-266.

49. Fa-hsien says that ten *li* to the north-east of the city there is the wild-deer park. Formerly a Pratyekabuddha resided there, and there were always some wild deers who stopped with him for the night; hence the name.

A quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 34 (LEGGE, p. 94).

50. After this, Fa-hsien again stayed in Pāṭaliputra. Following again the river Ganges eastward, on its southern bank there is the great kingdom of Chan-p'o 瞻婆 (Campā).

These are the first words of Fa-hsien's ch. 37 (LEGGE, p. 100). Campā was the capital of the kingdom of Aṅga, corresponding to the modern districts of Bhagalpur and Monghyr.[1] Campā has been rightly identified by CUNNINGHAM with the modern hamlet of Champanagar, four miles to the west of Bhagalpur.[2]

51. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that on the bend of the Ganges next to the east there is the kingdom of Campā. To the south of the town there is the pond Pu-ch'ia-lan 卜佉蘭. The river Ganges is to the north. In this place the Buddha expounded the prohibitions.

The pond near which the Buddha expounded the ten *śīla.* or moral prohibitions for the monks, is called in the Pali texts Gaggarā or Gaggarā-pokkharaṇī (Skr. *puṣkariṇī*, lotus pond), Pu-ch'ia-lan, ancient *puk-k'ia-lân*, is the transcription of a Prakrit *pukkharaṇī*, nearly identical with the Pali form.

The Gaggarā-pokkharaṇī " may be identified with the large silted-up lake now called Sarovar, situated on the skirts of Champanagar, from the depth of which Buddhist and Jaina statues were recovered, when partially re-excavated from time to time ".[3]

1) On the role played by Campā in the life of the Buddha see B. C. LAW, *Aṅga and Campā in the Pali literature*, in JASB, 1925, pp. 137-142.
2) *Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 546-547.
3) N. L. DEY, *Notes on ancient Aṅga or the district of Bhagalpur*, in JASB, 1914, p. 335.

16b **52.** The river Ganges again flows through the kingdom of Po-li 波麗; it is the kingdom of the maternal grandfather of the Buddha.

We have here a case of confusion due to similarity of sounds. Mahāmāyā, the mother of the Buddha, was the daughter of a lord of the Koliya, whose dwellings were at a short distance to the east of Kapilavastu, somewhere in what is now Nepalese Terai. But the Po-li of the texts is on the lower Ganges, below Campā. The ancient pronounciation was *puâ-liei*, and this reminds us of the Buli of the Pali texts, whose capital was Allakappa; they dwelt in the modern Muzzaffarpur and Shahabad districts, on both banks of the Ganges. If we accept the identification, then we must assume that this paragraph has been misplaced by Li Tao-yüan, and should be placed before § 50.

53. Fa-hsien says that the river Ganges continues to the east and reaches the kingdom of To-mo-li-ch'ien 多摩梨靬,[1] [the capital of] which is a sea port.

This is a quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 37 (LEGGE, p. 100). To-mo-li-ch'ien is Tāmralipti, the great sea port at the mouth of the Hughli, where Fa-hsien took ship for Ceylon. *Ch'ien* is of course an error for *ti*, which is the correct reading in SS and Fa-hsien. But the error goes certainly back to Li Tao-yüan himself, or even to his source, otherwise there would be no point in the remark which represents § 54.

54. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that Ta-ch'in 大秦 is called by another name Li-ch'ien 梨靬.

This quotation is of course wholly out of place here. Li Tao-yüan was tempted by the wrong reading [To-mo-]li-ch'ien

1) SS reads the last character *ti* 帝.

into an identification with the name Li-ch'ien or Li-kan, occurring in the *Han-shu*. Li-kan, which is probably derived from Alexandria, is geographically synonimous with Ta-ch'in and Fu-lin and indicates the Hellenistic and Roman Orient.

55. The *Fu-nan-chuan* of K'ang T'ai says that from south-west of the island of Chia-na-t'iao one enters a great bay of about 7-800 *li* and arrives at the mouth of the great river Chih-hu-li. Crossing the river and continuing westward, one reaches eventually Ta-ch'in.

He also says that coming out of the port of Chü-li 拘利 one enters the great bay. Travelling straight to the north-west for more than a year, one reaches the mouth of the river of India, which is called the river Ganges. At the mouth of the river there is a kingdom called Tan-mei 擔袂 [1] (Tāmralipti), which belongs to India. [Its ruler] sent letters to the Yellow Gate (the Chinese court), and was appointed [by China] king of Tan-mei.

We have met already with Chia-na-t'iao in § 5. There are two possibilities. Either we take it as it stands, and then the reconstruction would be Kaṇadvīpa,[2] or rather Gaṇadvīpa; the latter name is known from the Rāmāyaṇa,[3] which lists it together with Suvarṇarūpyaka (the Suvarṇakuḍyaka of Kṣemendra); Gaṇadvīpa therefore may be located in the Malayan peninsula or in Indonesia, which seems to suit the indications of our text. Or else we may admit an inversion of the first two characters (we find for this a parallel in a text of the *Pei-hu-lu*), and we restore it as Nāgadvīpa.[4] It would then be related to the Nāgadīpa of the *Valahassa Jataka* and Nagadiba of Ptolemy; but these

1) ST, SW and SY have Tan-chih 擔袟. I have followed SS.

2) PELLIOT, *Quelques textes chinois concernant l'Indochine hindouisée*, in *Etudes Asiatiques de l'E. F. E. O.*, vol. II, pp. 251-252.

3) Ed. Gorresio, IV, 40, 33.

4) R. STEIN *Le Lin-yi*, p. 293.

are localized on the coast of Ceylon,[1] which goes against the indications of our text. The first alternative is certainly more credible.

For Chih-hu-li, a name of the Rapti, mistaken by K'ang T'ai for the Ganges, see § 13.

Chü-li is identical with T'ou-chü-li 役拘利 of the *Liang-shu* and Ptolemy's Takkola; it is modern Takuapa, on the Siamese west coast of the Malayan peninsula.[2]

K'ang T'ai's account of the lower Ganges, read together with Fa-hsien, sheds an interesting sidelight on the hydrography of 5th century Bengal. The Bhagirathī, which leaves the Ganges a little distance below Gaur, is one of the water courses contributing to the formation of the Hughli. It is a dying river now, but it is well-known that in former times its channel was as important as, and even more important than, the Padma, which now conveys by far the greater part of the Ganges waters to the Meghna estuary.[3] For K'ang T'ai the Bhagirathī is apparently the main channel of the Ganges, since Tāmralipti is the port where the Ganges enters the sea. This means that the relative importance of the Bhagirathī and the Padma has been reversed in the last 1500 years. In view of the antiquity of our text (3rd century A. D.), its importance for the history of the Bengal rivers cannot be underestimated.

1) The wording of Ptolemy and of the Jataka are quite clear about it; it is a coastal islet. To identify Nāgadvīpa with the Nicobars, as proposed by GERINI, *Researches on Ptolemy's geography of Eastern Asia*, London, 1909, pp. 379-383 and supported by V. S. AGRAVALA, *Identification of Nāgadvīpa*, in *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, XXIII (1937), pp. 133-137, is doing violence to the texts.

2) PELLIOT, *Le Fou-nan*, p. 266; *Deux itinéraires*, p. 386. CHAVANNES, in J. As., 1903[II], p. 530. S. LÉVI, *Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Bṛhatkathā*, in *Études Asiatiques de l'E. F. E. O.*, vol. II, pp. 3-19.

3) R. C. MAJUMDAR, *Physical features of ancient Bengal*, in *D. R. Bhandarkar Volume*, Calcutta, 1940, pp. 344-346; see also *History of Bengal*, vol. I, Dacca, 1943, pp. 3-4.

If we could determine the precise date of the embassy of Tāmralipti to China, it would be an important result from many points of view. The embassy is mentioned by K'ang-T'ai, who was a subject of the southern Wu dynasty (222-280); thus the embassy would be expected to be addressed to the court of that dynasty in Nanking. But no such embassy is registered in the annals (*pên-chi*) of the Wu in the *San-kuo-chih*.

56. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that the river Ganges flows to the east and enters the Eastern Sea. Thus it is that the two rivers which flow, and the two seas which receive them, are one each to the east and west.

The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* means simply that the Indus and the Ganges run into the sea respectively to the west and east of the Indian peninsula.

The rest of ch. 1 concerns mainly the K'un-lun.

SECTION B

(from ch. 2)

The beginning of the chapter describes the unnamed river which issues from the Tsʻung-ling mountains and empties itself into the Lei-chu sea, i. e. the Aral. Then it goes on to say:

2 a **57.** The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that the I-lo-chʻi-ti 蜺羅跂禘 river issues from the north-western side of the A-nou-ta and flows in the kingdom of Yü-tien 千闐 (Khotan).

This I-lo-chʻi-ti presents a serious problem. Its ancient pronounciation was *ngiei-lâ-gʻjie̯-tiei*; there is no Sanskrit or Prakrit name of river which may be recalled by this. It flows from Central Himalaya to Khotan (§ 57), north of Kāpiśi and Gandhāra (§§ 59, 60, 65) and empties itself into the Lei-chu or Aral sea (§ 65). This river seems to have been pieced together with bits of information concerning at least two river systems: the Khotan-darya and the Amu-darya. Besides, Li Tao-yüan seems to connect it somehow with the Ghorband-Panjshir-Kabul system. No similar piece of hydrography has yet been pointed out from Buddhistic sources; it stands wholly isolated.

58. The chapter on the Western Countries in the *Han-shu* says that to the west of Khotan all the rivers flow westward and go to the western sea.

The passage referred to is *Han-shu*, ch. 96 *a*, f. 8 *a*.

2b **59.** Then it flows westward to the north of the four great stūpas. What Fa-hsien calls the kingdom of Chiu-shih-lo 糺尸羅 (Takṣaśīla), means in Chinese (漢) "severed head" (截頭). When the Buddha was a Bodhisattva, he gave away his head to a man, and this fact gave the name to the kingdom. To the east of the kingdom [of Gandhāra] is the place where he offered himself as food for a hungry tiger. In all these places stūpas have been built.

Except for the first sentence, the whole paragraph is a quotation of the first part of Fa-hsien's ch. 11 (LEGGE, p. 32).

On the "gift of the head" see the bibliography quoted in LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 144 *n.*

The place where the Buddha offered himself to the tiger is on mount Banj, not far from the Mahaban spur in south-eastern Buner.[1] On the legend see the bibliography in LAMOTTE, op. cit., p. 143 *n.*

60. It flows further westward, to the north of the kingdom of Chien-t'o-wei 揵陀衛 (Gandhāra). This is the city which was governed by Fa-i 法益 (Dharmavivardhana), the son of king Aśoka. When the Buddha was a Bodhisattva, in this kingdom he also gave his eyes away to a man. It this place too a great stūpa has been built.

Except for the first sentence, the whole paragraph is a quotation of Fa-hsien's ch. 10 (LEGGE, pp. 31-32).

Chien-t'o-wei is Fa-hsien's usual name for Gandhāra. We may recall that Chien-t'o-wei, ancient *g'i̯ɒn-d'â-ji̯ʷäi*, transcribes a Prakrit form *Gandhavāī, derived from an earlier *Gandhavādī, corresponding to Sanskrit Gandhavatī.[2]

In the times of Fa-hsien the capital of Gandhāra was still Puṣkalavatī (modern Charsadda), although it was fast being

1) A. STEIN, in ASIAR *Frontier Circle*, 1904-5, pp. 33-45. For an inscription there see STEN KONOW, *Corp. Inscr. Ind.*, vol. II, I, pp. 55-57.

2) See e. g. PELLIOT, *Les noms propres du Milindapañha*, p. 393 *n.*

superseded by its younger rival Puruṣapura (Peshawar). The pilgrim was wrong in localizing there the legend of Aśoka's son Dharmavivardhana or Kunāla, the scene of which was in Taxila, as related at length in the *Aśokāvadāna*.[1)]

The stūpa of the "gift of the eyes" near Puṣkaravatī was visited also by Hsüan-tsang.[2)] On the legend see the bibliography cited by LAMOTTE, op. cit., p. 144 *n*.

61. Again there is the kingdom of Fu-lou-sha 弗樓沙 (Puruṣapura). Śakra, king of the gods, took the shape of a little herd-boy and scraped together some earth in the shape of a stūpa of the Buddha. The Dharmarāja [saw it and] therefore [built] a great stūpa. [These are] what are called the Four Great Stūpas.

This paragraph is an abridgement of Fa-hsien's ch. 12 (LEGGE, pp. 33-34).

62. The *Fa-hsien-chuan* says etc. [*omitted*].

There follows a quotation from Fa-hsien's ch. 12 (LEGGE, pp. 34-35), giving the legend of the alms-bowl of the Buddha and its miraculous powers.

3 *a* **63.** Fo-t'u-t'iao says that the bowl of the Buddha is made of green jade. It contains more than three bushels (斗). This kingdom holds it as sacred. At the time of the offerings, if they desire that [the bowl] may not become full with the scented flowers of a whole day's [offering, it happens] as they have said; and if they desire that it may be filled with a handful, it also [happens] at once as they have said.

A similar legend in Fa-hsien's ch. 12 (LEGGE, p. 36).

1) PRZYLUSKI, *La legende de l'empereur Açoka*, pp. 281-294. Hsüan-tsang did not make the same mistake and localizes the legend in Taxila; WATTERS, vol. I, pp. 245-246.

2) WATTERS, vol. I, p. 215.

64. Also according to what the monk Chu Fa-wei says, the bowl of the Buddha is in the kingdom of the Great Yüeh-chih 大月支. They have built a stūpa 30 *chang* 丈 high, with seven storeys. The place of the bowl is in the second storey; there is a golden net, and the net covers all around the bowl. The bowl is of green stone. He also says that the bowl floats in the space, to wait
3 b till [the Buddha] will place the bowl on a golden tablet. A mark of one foot of the Buddha is together with the bowl in the same place. The king, the nobles and the people, all of them holding Brahma-perfume, the seven kinds of jewels and jade, make offerings to the stūpa and the footprint. The tooth of the Buddha, the robe, the *uṣṇīṣa*, all these relics are certainly in the kingdom of Fu-lou-sha.

On this paragraph, and generally on the alms-bowl of the Buddha (for which cfr. also § 9), see CHAVANNES, *Voyage de Song Yun*, p. 433, and S. LÉVI, *Notes chinoises sur l'Inde*, V, in BEFEO, V (1905), pp. 294-299.

According to Hsüan-tsang the ruined stupa of the bowl was inside Peshawar, in the north-eastern part of the town;[1] the place has never been identified, much less excavated.

The relics mentioned in the last sentence of our text were all of them preserved at Nagarahāra (modern Jalalabad) and in its neighbourhood.[2] Fa-wei seems to imply that in his time Nagarahāra was a part of the kingdom of Puruṣapura. The kingdom of the Ta Yüeh-chih is the state of the Kidāras, the last epigons of the Kushan, who lasted till the middle of the 4th century.

65. The *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* says that to the north-west of the royal capital of Chien-t'o-yüeh (Gandhāra) there is the city of Po-t'u-lo-yüeh 鉢吐羅越, [which is] the royal city of the robe of the Buddha. To the east there is a monastery. Following again and again the stream [as it winds its way], ten *li* to the north-west, there is the whirlpool of the Nāga Ho-pu-lo 河步羅; it is the place where the Buddha went to a whirlpool to wash his robe. The washing stone is still preserved.

1) WATTERS, vol. I, p. 202.
2) See Fa-hsien's ch. 13 and CHAVANNES, *Voyage de Song Yun*, pp. 428-429.

Po-t'u-lo-yüeh, ancient *puât-t'uo-lâ-ji̯ʷäi*, is the name of the royal city of the robe (Nagarahāra); for the moment it seems impossible to reconstruct the Indian original.[1]

The following text is not very clear and is perhaps fragmentary. It is impossible to identify the unnamed monastery, and it is not even clear whether it is east of Nagarāhara or of Peshawar (or Puṣkalavatī?). Then again some words are certainly missing, because we are suddenly transported in Upper Swat, and there is no trace of the locality from which the ten *li* north-westward are calculated.

Ho(河)-pu-lo is an error for A(阿)-pu-lo, ancient *'â-b'uo-lâ*, which is the same as the A-po-lo-lo 阿波羅羅 of other texts. It is the Nāga Apalāla, dwelling in the Swat river, converted by the Buddha during his legendary journey in North-Western India.[2] The legend was once localized in Magadha, and only later it was shifted to Uḍḍiyāna, where Hsüan-tsang heard of it.[3] Sir Harold Deane localized the pool at Kalam in Swat Kohistan, where the streams from the valleys of Utrot and Ushu meet to form the head of the Swat valley.[4] This has been accepted by Sir Aurel Stein.[5] But it seems we must draw a distinction. The above identification suits perfectly well the description of Hsüan-tsang, and there is no doubt that the great pilgrim saw the pool of Apalāla at the head of the Swat river. But Fa-hsien mentions in the same

1) Following in a mechanical way the more usual transcription values, one would obtain such nonsense as *Patthuravatī. I can only say that the first three syllables remind me of *paḏhra* of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, corresponding to Skr. *pṛthivi*, earth.

2) See PRZYLUSKI, *Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde dans le Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādins*, in J. As., 1914[II], pp. 510-512; *La legende de l'empereur Açoka*, pp. 6-7; and the further bibliography cited in LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 188 *n* and 548-550 *n*.

3) WATTERS, vol. I, p. 229; cfr. also Fa-hsien's ch. 8 (LEGGE, p. 29).

4) DEANE, *Notes on Udyana and Gandhara* in JRAS, 1896, p. 656.

5) *Serindia*, p. 8; *An archaeological tour in Upper Swat*, p. 58.

breath the pool and the rock on which the Buddha dried his robe (for which see back § 9); and the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi*, which is perhaps even earlier, definitely says that rock and pool are in one and the same place. We must conclude therefore that in the 4th and 5th centuries the pond was localized, like the rock, about four miles below Tirat. In the two centuries intervening till the journey of Hsüan-tsang the legend shifted up river as far as the confluence of the Utrot and Ushu streams.

66. This river runs towards An-hsi 安息 (Persia) to the Lei-chu 雷翥 (Aral) sea. It is also said that to the west of Chien-tʻo-yüeh (Gandhāra) in the middle of the Western Sea there is the kingdom of An-hsi.

This too is a quotation from the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi.* The rest of the course of the I-lo-chʻi-ti refers clearly to the Oxus. The unknown monk who compiled the *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* seems to have very hazy idea about the Farthest West. He connects the Caspian Sea with the Persian Gulf and perhaps even with the Mediterranean and Black Sea, to form one great ocean surrounding Iran.

67. The *Fu-nan-chi* of Chu Chih says that from the kingdom of An-hsi to the kingdom of Ssŭ-ho-tʻiao there are 20.000 *li*; the land of this kingdom borders with the sea. They are therefore the Tʻien-chu (India) and An-hsi kingdoms of the *Han-shu*.

For Ssŭ-ho-tʻiao see the note to § 30 (*a*). The *Fu-nan-chi* refers here to information gathered in Fu-nan. It seems that we have here an echo of that sea route from the mouth of the Euphrates-Tigris to Hormuz and along the coast of Western India to Ceylon, which was so active and so frequented during the palmy days of the Roman trade to the east in the first two or three centuries of our era.

The utterly wrong conclusion that Ssŭ-ho-tʻiao was the Tʻien-chu of the *Han-shu* seems to be due to Li Tao-yüan.

APPENDIX

CHI-PIN

Chi-pin is one of the most famous but also most puzzling terms of the Chinese geography of north-western India. For a long time its most current interpretation has been that propounded by Chavannes and S. Lévi about half a century ago. CHAVANNES expressed it in the following words: "From the period of the Han to that of the Northern Wei, the name Chi-pin applies only and always to Kashmir, as proved in several ways by the travels of the Buddhist pilgrims. It is only in the T'ang period that the name Chi-pin is rather unhappily connected with the name Kāpiśi, and serves henceforward to indicate this last country".[1] This theory was soon challenged for the period of the Former Han, but many scholars still accept it with more or less conviction.[2]

Chi-pin appears for the first time in the Chinese texts in the notice dedicated to it by the *Han-shu*, ch. 96 *a*, ff. 10 *a* - 13 *a*,[3] which refers to conditions prevailing in the first century B. C.

1) CHAVANNES, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei-lio*, in TP, VI (1905), p. 538 *n*.

2) A good résumé of the views of Chavannes, S. Lévi and Pelliot on this subject has been given by P. C. BAGCHI, *Ki-pin and Kashmir*, in *Sino-Indian Studies*, II (1946-7), pp. 42-53.

3) The best translation, in spite of the awful transcription system employed, is still that of DE GROOT, *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens*, vol. II: *Die Westlande Chinas in der vorchristlichen Zeit*, Berlin, 1926, pp. 86-91.

and beginning of the first century A. D. Its geographical position is determined by the following data: Nan-tou (Dardistan) is 9 days or 330 *li* to the north-east; the Great Yüeh-chih (at that time having their seats in Bactriana) are to the north-west (north according to ch. 96 *a*, f. 14 *b*); Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia) is to the south-west. Then follows an interesting historical account, which has not yet been interpreted with certainty.[1] I think it is now pretty well agreed that the Chi-pin of the *Han-shu* was a large but ill-defined area in the north-west, corresponding at first to the realm of the Śakas in India (founded probably at the end of the 2nd century B. C.), and comprising Gandhāra, Kāpiśi, parts of Western Panjab, but probably excluding Kashmir; it was thus practically co-extensive with the ancient Gandhāra satrapy of Achaemenid administration. The demonstration has been made several times, by sinologists, iranists and indologists, and I am not going to repeat it here.[2] In any case Chi-pin, already at its first appearance on the stage of history, seems to be more a political than a geographical term.

The origin of the name Chi-pin has not been much discussed. It is usually assumed that Chi-pin, ancient *kiäi-pi̯ĕn*, archaic *ki̯ad-pi̯ĕn*, transcribes a form *Kaspīra, not occurring in Indian texts, but known from such transcriptions as Ptolemy's Kaspeiraioi and

1) TARN, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge, 1938, pp. 340-343 had followed v. Gutschmid in applying this account to the Greeks in India (Wu-t'ou-lao = *adelphou*, Yin-mo-fu = Hermaios); but the equations are phonetically untenable. See ALTHEIM, *Weltgeschichte Asiens im griechischen Zeitalter*, vol. II, Halle, 1948, pp. 123-125.

2) FRANKE, *Beiträge* etc., p. 59; STEN KONOW, *Corp. Inscr. Ind.*, II-I, pp. xxiii-xxv; HERZFELD, *Sakastan* (Arch. Mitt. aus Iran IV), 1932, pp. 21, 31-32; TARN, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 339-343, 469-473; now also VAN LOHUIZEN-DE LEEUW, *The "Scythian Period"*, Leiden, 1949, pp. 370-373. For the Gandhāra satrapy, which was enormously larger than historical Gandhāra, see FOUCHER, *La vieille route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila* (MDAFA I), Paris, 1942-1947, p. 193.

Kaspeira. *Kaspīra would be another form for a Prakrit *Kaś-vīra, which now survives in the Kashmiri vernacular form Kaśīr.[1]

There are several objections that may be advanced against this theory. First of all, *chi* was normally used for transcribing a sound *ka*;[2] we miss any trace of a representation of the sibilant, which plays such an important part in the series *Kaspīra-*Kaśvīra-Kaśīr. Another element must also be taken in account. The *Candragarbha-sūtra* is a text originated in Central Asia (Khotan), where some fragments of the original have come to light.[3] Its Chinese translation by Narendrayaśas (d. 596) supplies us with the form Chi-pin-na 罽賓那.[4] Now, Narendrayaśas was born in Uḍḍiyāna and the text he translated was of Khotanese origin. It is most probable that his Chi-pin-na reproduces a pronounciation current on both sides of the Pamir; or else he wished to restore the final vowel -*a*, led by the same tendency towards Sanskritic purism which later led Hsüan-tsang and I-ching to employ e. g. such a form as Wu-chʻang-na in the place of Wu-chʻang hitherto used for Uḍḍiyāna. In both cases, the form Chi-pin-na means that Narendrayaśas was conscious that the final nasal of Chi-pin did not transcribe an -*r*, as required if the original were Kaśmīra,

1) A. Stein, *Kalhana's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Westminster, 1900, vol. II, p. 386. The demonstration of the phonetical identity Chi-pin = Kashmir was first attempted by S. Lévi and Chavannes in their study on Chi-pin in J. As., 1895^II, pp. 371-384. It is only fair to point out that such an authority as the late Professor Pelliot was also convinced of the identity; *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, in J. As., 1934^I, p. 39 *n*.

2) Fa-hsien uses it for the first syllable of the name Kanauj; see back § 25. Kumā-rajīva (d. 409-13) in his translation of the *Sūtrālaṁkāra* uses it for transcribing the first syllable of Kaniṣka; Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, in J. As., 1896^II, p. 452.

3) Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford, 1916, vol. I, pp. 103-108.

4) *Taishō*, vol. XIII, p. 367 *b*. See Lévi, *Notes chinoises sur l'Inde*, V, in BEFEO, V (1905), pp. 261-263, 285; and Pelliot, in BEFEO, V, p. 454.

but an -*n*; the underlying original was therefore something like *Kapīṇa.[1] As a geographical term, such a word is not to be found in Indian literature; it is, instead, well known as a personal name. I refer to king Mahā-Kapphiṇa or Mahā-Kappiṇa, the hero of a whole cycle of legends in Pāli and Sanskrit. He is represented as ruling in Kukkuṭavatī, a frontier region, and this legend is definitely localized in the extreme north-west of India, as he is stated to have met the Buddha on the banks of the Candrabhagā (Chenab) river.[2] The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins gives a variant of the same legend; Kapphiṇa is a Brahman, who meets the Buddha during the latter's journey to the north-west.[3] King Kappiṇa and Chi-pin are both remains of a piece of ancient lore concerning some region in Upper India. It may be that further research in this direction will yield more definite results, but already now I think that a

1) By his Chi-pin-na, Narendrayaśas meant undoubtedly Kashmir. This is rendered certain by the name of the Nāga Hou-lo-ch'a 睺羅茶, which appears in the text as one of the protecting deities of Chi-pin-na. Hou-lo-ch'a, ancient *γəu-lâ-d''a*, transcribes *Hulaḍa, and this is clearly identical with Holaḍā, which occurs in the *Rājataraṅginī* as the name of the district around the Wular lake in Kashmir; STEIN, *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅginī*, vol. II, p. 460. It is true that in the *Nīlamata* (ed. De Vreese, Leiden, 1936, Index) and in the *Rājataraṅginī* the Nāga of the lake is never called Holaḍa or anything like, but always Mahāpadma. However, the phonetic equivalence Hou-lo-ch'a - Holaḍā - Wular, which was first tentatively suggested by F. W. THOMAS (*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan*, vol. I, London, 1935, p. 107 *n*), is beyond doubt. But here I am concerned only with the origin of the word Chi-pin, not with its meaning for a Buddhist translator of the 6th century.

2) MALALASEKERA, *Dictionary of Pāli proper names*, London, 1937-8, vol. II, pp. 473-475. A possible connection with Chi-pin was already suggested by GAURIŚANKAR, *Kapphiṇābhyudaya of Kaśmīrabhaṭṭa Śivasvāmin* (Penjab University Pubblications n. 26), Lahore, 1937, pp. xl-xlii. BAILEY, *Irano-Indica III*, in BSOAS XIII (1950), p. 395, proposes to connect Kapphina with Kalpin (Kapphina's father), since in many cases a Prakrit -*pp*(*h*)- corresponds to Sanskrit -*lp*-. But there is always the possibility, perhaps probability, that Kalpin may be a savant Sanskritized reconstruction from Kapphina.

3) *Gilgit Manuscripts*, ed. by Nalinaksha Dutt and Pandit Shivram Nath Shastri, vol. III, p. 1, Srinagar, 1942, pp. 266 and 279.

case has been made out for entirely dissociating the group Chi-pin - Chi-pin-na - Kappiṇa from *Kaspīra.

Though this is not strictly relevant to my subject, I shall briefly discuss the opinion of FOUCHER on the data of the Greek authors that are usually put in relation with Chi-pin and Kashmir. He maintains that Kaspapyros of Hecataeus (fr. 178), Kaspatyros of Herodotus (IV, 44) and the Kaspeiraioi of Ptolemy (VII, 1, 47) have nothing to do with Kashmir, but refer to Multan; one of the ancient names of this town was Kaśyapapura,[1] and Kaspapyros (for which Kaspatyros is evidently an error) transcribes *Kass^{a}papura, while Kaspeiraioi is *Kass^{a}pa(p)urīya.[2] But how about the geographical facts? Kaspapyros is the place where Skylax of Karyanda, sent by king Darius I to explore India, took ship to descend the river to the sea; and since it was in the land Paktyike (according to Herodotus) or in Gandhāra (according to Hecataeus), it is far more obvious to look for it in the neighbourhood of Attock, or perhaps at Peshawar itself.[3] With Kaspeiraioi and cognate forms, things are still less satisfactory. First, I do not see any cogent reason why we should identify them with Kaspatyros.

1) Utpala's commentary to the *Bṛhatsaṁhita* of Varāhamihira is usually quoted as authority for this. But the passage in question is not found in the extant text of Utpala; it is known only through a quotation in al-Berūnī; SACHAU, *Alberuni's India*, London, 1910, vol. I, p. 298. Other traditions connecting the famous sage and solar deity Kaśyapa with Multan have been collected by CUNNINGHAM, *Ancient Geography of India*, p. 267; but it is highly suspicious that up to now nobody has been able to cite a single original text as evidence.

2) FOUCHER, *Les satrapies orientales de l'empire achéménide*, in *Comptes Rendus, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1938, pp. 347-348, *La vieille route de l'Inde*, pp. 194-199.

3) See e. g. HERZFELD, *Contacts between the Old Iranian Empire and India*, in *India Antiqua*, Leiden, 1947, pp. 182-183; KRAMERS, *Peshawar*, in *Ann. Bibl. Ind. Arch.*, XV (for 1940-1947), pp. XVIII and XXI. R. C. MAJUMDAR, *Achaemenian Rule in India*, in IHQ, XXV (1949), pp. 159-160, wants to locate Kaspatyros at Sehwan in Sind, which is certainly too far down the river.

In the second place, Foucher himself remarked that perhaps we must avoid confusing Kasperia, Kaspiria or Kaspireia of Ptolemy's § 42 with Kaspeira of § 49, which is placed at a much lower latitude. The first would be Kashmir, the second Multan.[1] This is possibly correct; but in any case we have positive evidence of the phonetical equivalence of Kasperia-Kaspiria with Kashmir. It comes from Central Asia. We have the early Khotanese form Kaspär-,[2] reproduced as Kas-par in the Tibetan translation of the *Vimalaprabhā-paripṛccha*.[3] Then there is the Parthian form Qšpyr, found in a sort of catalogue of the Yakṣa on an amulet of the 4th-6th centuries.[4] Both forms, referring with certainty to Kashmir, are unmistakably identical with Kasperia and Kaspiria; Multan is here out of question.

The conclusion of the above discussion is that we have on the one side Chi-pin(-na) and Kapp(h)iṇa, unconnected with Kaśmīra; and on the other side Kasperia, Kaspär-, Qšpyr, *Kaspīra, *Kaśvīra, Kaśīr.

Coming again to our Chinese texts, the next mention of Chi-pin is found in the *Hou Han-shu* and refers to conditions in the second half of the first and first half of the second centuries A. D. The text is very meagre: " Starting from P'i-shan, when one travels towards the south-west, he passes through Wu-hao 烏秏, crosses the Hanging Passages, passes through Chi-pin, and at the end of more than sixty days' march arrives

1) FOUCHER, *La vieille route de l'Inde*, p. 252 *n*.

2) LEUMANN, *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus* (Abh. f. d. Kunde d. Morg. XX), Leipzig, 1933-1936, ch. XXIV, v. 5 (p. 291). See also the revised translation of the passage concerning Kaspär- by STEN KONOW, *On Professor Leumann's new Saka text*, in Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap, XI (1939), pp. 28-30.

3) THOMAS, *Tibetan Literary Texts* etc., vol. I, p. 193.

4) HENNING, *Two Manichaean magical texts*, in BSOAS, XII (1947), pp. 55-56.

in the kingdom of Wu-i-shan-li".[1] Wu-hao is identical with Wu-ch'a (*Uḍa) of the *Shui-ching-chu*, in the Pamirs. The route leads thence through the Hanging Passages on the Indus and through Chi-pin to Arachosia, i. e. roughly to the region of Kandahar. From Gilgit to Kandahar the logical route is along the Indus or (in order to avoid its impassable gorges) through Swat to the Peshawar plains (Gandhāra) and thence to Kandahar via Jalalabad-Kabul or via the Zhob. A detour through the Kashmir valley is much less probable. Chi-pin may correspond here to Gandhāra and may extend to cover Kāpiśi as well, with which political relations were most close. Kashmir is out of the question.

Then we have the statement, interesting from the historical point of view, that Kuzula Kadphises "conquered An-hsi (Parthia) and Kao-fu (Kabul). Then he subjugated Pu-ta 濮達 and Chi-pin".[2] Pu-ta, ancient *b'uok-d'ât*, is perhaps the Paktyike of the Greek authors,[3] somewhere in Central Afghanistan. Chi-pin, the first conquest of the Kushan in India proper, must here correspond roughly to Gandhāra and West Panjab; Taxila was certainly included in it, as we know that Kuzula Kadphises succeeded there the Parthian dynasty of Gondophares.

Another mention of Chi-pin in the *Han-shu* is in connection with Kao-fu. This country (modern Kabul) was then seldom independent[4] and belonged in turn to T'ien-chu (India),

1) *Hou Han-shu*, ch. 118, f. 11 *a-b*. CHAVANNES, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Heou Han-chou*, in TP, VIII (1907), p. 175.

2) *Hou Han-shu*, ch. 118, f. 15 *b*. CHAVANNES, op. cit., pp. 191-192.

3) FRANKE, *Beiträge* etc., p. 99.

4) It should be kept in mind that Kabul 2000 years ago had not by far the same importance as today, but was left far behind, both from the political and the commercial point of view, by its northern neighbour Kāpiśi (Begram). See the interesting remarks by FOUCHER, *La vieille route de l'Inde*, pp. 29-34.

Chi-pin and An-hsi (Parthia), according to which of these kingdoms was stronger.[1] Conditions here described refer to the time prior to the Kushan conquest, because only a few lines before it has been told how Kuzula Kadphises had conquered Kao-fu and Chi-pin.[2] I take the enumeration to be in chronological order; T'ien-chu refers to the rule of Indian kings (the Mauryas, and then the line of Sophagasenos, during the whole of the 3rd century B. C.). Chi-pin may mean here Maues's Śaka state in the Panjab, which, however, seems not to have extended (except perhaps as a suzerain power) to Kāpiśa-Kabul; or else, more probably, it refers to the rule of the Greek kings. An-hsi is probably not Parthia proper, but the Indo-Parthian kingdom of Gondophares, to whom Kāpiśi belonged in the first years of our era. Again, Kashmir has nothing to do with this.

On the whole, I would say that in the *Hou Han-shu* Chi-pin represents the region of the North-Western frontier dominated in turn by the Greek, the Śaka, the Parthians and the Kushan. Since Kaniṣka, it included also Kashmir.

The texts discussed up to now belong to the official, Confucianist, historiography. But starting from the Later Han dynasty, i. e. the period covered by the *Hou Han-shu*, we have to turn our attention also to another tradition, in which Chi-pin has quite another meaning: that of the translations of the Chinese Tripiṭaka. They are wholly independent in style, origin and outlook from the official historiography, and the two traditions run for centuries parallel to each other, and to a great extent ignoring each other.

For practical purposes we can assume that the work of translating Indian Buddhist texts into Chinese started in the

1) *Hou Han-shu*, ch. 118, ff. 15 *b*-16 *a*; CHAVANNES, op. cit., p. 192.
2) CHAVANNES, loc. cit.

2nd century A. D. The translators at first were, for the greater part, men from Greater India (Central Asia and Indochina); these foreigners had to struggle with the difficulty of adapting the stock of geographical names already possessed by the Chinese to the nomenclature of the Sanskrit original. Also the name Chi-pin was subjected to this adaptation, and the result was peculiar. In the 2nd century Chi-pin practically meant the Indian dominions of the Kushan. Its political centre was Gandhāra, but its religious centre was Kashmir; it is there that later accounts place the so-called council of Kaniṣka; it was in Kashmir that a good deal of the texts of Mahāyāna was elaborated. It was therefore quite natural if the rather vague term Chi-pin of the annals was applied by the translators to that country included in the realm of Chi-pin, which was most important for them: Kashmir. This was also helped by the resemblance of Chi-pin to the Prakrit form *Kaspīr (Kashmir), although, as shown above, the two words were originally quite independent of each other. We may even suppose that in the 2nd century A. D. the name *Kaspīr was popularly extended to the whole of the Indian dominions of the Kushan, as the Kaspeiraioi of Ptolemy seems to imply and as it has indeed been suggested by S. LÉVI.[1]

In any case, it is an established fact that the word Chi-pin in the early translations of the Chinese Tripiṭaka is normally employed for Sanskrit Kaśmīra;[2] this can be checked wherever

1) *Le catalogue des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī*, p. 91.

2) There is one exception. Kumārajīva in his translations of the *Sūtrālaṁkāra* and of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* (both made about 402-405) applies the name Chi-pin to Kāpiśi; LÉVI, *Açvaghoṣa, le Sūtrālaṁkāra et ses versions*, in J. As., 1908^II, pp. 81-83; LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 542 and 550 *n*. The fact is now well established, notwithstanding the doubts expressed by PELLIOT in BEFEO, IX (1909), p. 168. It shows that even in the Buddhist tradition the equation Chi-pin = Kashmir was not absolutely without exceptions.

the Sanskrit original has been preserved. The Chinese pil-grims too followed at first the lead given by the sacred texts they had studied before leaving home; it is beyond doubt that in their accounts Chi-pin is, and cannot be anything else but, Kashmir.[1] This lasted till Hsüan-tsang introduced the learned spelling Chia-ssŭ-mi-lo, based directly on the Sanskrit Kaśmīra.

I must, however, stress a point which is often lost sight of. Modern scholars are sometimes apt to think unconsciously of Kashmir in the shape as it appears on our maps. Modern Jammu and Kashmir state is a creation of the British, and its birth date is the treaty of Amritsar in 1846. Historical Kashmir has always included only and alone the valley of Kashmir and the inner slopes of the ring of mountains that surround it;[2] we except of course the campaigns of conquest of Kashmiri kings towards the plains. The whole of the Indus valley, and mainly the commercially important Gilgit area, although occasionally invaded by the kings of Kashmir and although always open to the cultural influence of the valley, was never an integrant part of the kingdom. Moreover, if Kashmir lies on one of the easiest routes from Central Asia to Eastern Panjab and the Ganges valley, it emphatically does not represent a convenient or logical passage from Central Asia to the centres of Gandhāra culture in Eastern Afghanistan and the North-Western Frontier Province. The normal route in this case was not that through Kashmir, nor even the direct but terribly difficult track along the Indus, but the once very frequented trails through Gilgit and then Chitral (for Kāpiśi) or Swat (for Gandhāra). This simple geographical fact must be kept present if one is to avoid drawing wrong conclusions from historical data.

1) The relevant materials are conveniently gathered in BAGCHI, *Ki-pin and Kashmir*, pp. 47-51.

2) STEIN, *Kalhana's Rājataranginī*, vol. II, p. 387.

To give an example, it has been inferred from the inscription of Wima Kadphises at Khalatse in Ladakh that this ruler held sway over Kashmir.[1] But the centre of the power of the early Kushan kings was in Gandhāra and Western Afghanistan, from which regions Khalatse would be reached by routes more direct if not easier than through Kashmir. It may be that Kashmir belonged to Wima Kadphises, but we cannot use the Khalatse inscription for proving it; beyond this, there is absolutely no other evidence to support the contention, and the arguments ex-silentio are rather against it.[2]

If, therefore, we accept the equivalence Chi-pin = Kashmir for the Chinese Buddhist literature from the 2nd to the early 7th century, it must be understood that we mean Kaśmīra in its strictest sense, i. e. the upper valley of the Jhelam.

As pointed out above, Buddhist tradition and Confucianist historiography for a long time ran on parallel lines without much reciprocal influence. After the *Hou Han-shu*, the next mention of Chi-pin in the dynastic histories is found in the *Wei-lüeh* (3rd century A. D.), which barely mentions the route leading from the regions subject to Khotan towards Chi-pin, Ta-hsia (Bactriana), Kao-fu (Kabul) and T'ien-chu (India), " which are all subject to the Yüeh-chih ".[3] We have no particulars about it, and this short mention does not allow any conclusion.

1) GHIRSHMAN, *Begram*, Cairo, 1946, p. 142. I think Ghirshman has given to Kashmir undue political weight in Kushan history, even if he is perfectly right about its cultural and religious importance. We must not forget that a valley hidden away in the midst of the mountains may for a moment become, but cannot remain for any length of time the centre of an empire. To shut themselves away in the fair but secluded vale of Kashmir, meant for the Kushan rulers cutting themselves deliberately away from easy communications with the rest of their dominions, especially with Bactriana.

2) BOYER, *L'inscription en Kharoṣṭhī du 15 Āṣāḍha, 136*, in J. As., 1915, p. 283.

3) Ap. *San-kuo-chih*, ch. 30, f. 32 *a*; CHAVANNES, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei-lio*, p. 538; DE GROOT, *Die Westlande Chinas*, p. 48.

Then comes a gap of two centuries. China broke up in two halves, of which the southern had no direct access to Central Asia and the northern was torn by unending wars between ephemeral dynasties claiming the imperial title but ruling for short periods only and on small parts of the country. Political intercourse with the West ceased. For the whole of the Chin period (265-420) we have only a short passage of Kuo I-kung's *Kuang-chih*, found in the commentary of Yen Shih-ku 顏師古 (581-645) to *Han-shu*, ch. 96 *a*, f. 11 *a*, but omitted in Ma Kuo-han's collection of the fragments of the *Kuang-chih*. It says: " The large dogs of Chi-pin are as big as donkeys and of red colour. From a distance of various *li* [the natives] use to shake tamburins in order to call them ".

It was not until Northern China had been unified by the Wei dynasty (386-534), that something like order returned and relations were resumed. But only in the last years of the dynasty, when the capital had been transferred from T'ai in northern Shansi to the classical Loyang (494), embassies from the states of north-western India found their way again to the imperial court. From these embassies the Chinese heard new names for old countries, names which rendered obsolete their classical geography of the Han times. The following table shows these embassies, as they are listed in the annals (*pên-chi*) of the *Wei-shu* (ch. 8 and 9):

Chi-pin	451, 502, 508, 517
Chia-pi-sha 伽比沙	503
Pu-liu-sha 不流沙	511
Kan-ta 乾達	511
Chia-shih-mi 伽使密	511

Chia-pi-sha, ancient *g'i̯a-pji-ṣa*, is Kāpiśa; Pu-liu-sha, ancient *pi̯əu-li̯əu-ṣa*, is Puruṣapura (Peshawar); Kan-ta, ancient *kân-d'ât*, is Gandhāra; Chia-shih-mi, ancient *g'i̯a-ṣi-mi̯ĕt*, is Kashmir.[1] The abundance of names is bewildering. Puruṣapura was the capital of Gandhāra, which was united with Kāpiśi under the same ruler, the Chionite (Hephthalite) king Mihiragula. Chipin apparently refers here to this united kingdom, i. e. the Chionite state of Zabulistan, the Hūṇas of the Indian inscriptions, which was the only strong power of north-western India in this period.[2] Perhaps the local governors or tributary princes had sent embassies of their own. The name Chia-shih-mi is most interesting; it is the first mention of the name Kashmir in the Chinese texts.

But when the accounts of the Western Countries were compiled, the authors took little or no notice of this kind of material. The original chapter on the Western Countries in the *Wei-shu* is lost and has been replaced by copying the corresponding chapter of the *Pei-shih* (compiled in the first half of the 7th century). In this chapter the authors tried to follow as far as possible the old accounts of the Han times. What new information they give, is due to another source. The Wei were a pro-Buddhist dynasty, and thus it happened that in 518 the Buddhist monk Hui-shêng and the official Sung Yün were sent as imperial envoys to Afghanistan and north-western India. After his return home in 522, Sung Yün, in his official capacity, wrote a report to the emperor about his voyage; this report was used by the compilers of the *Pei-shih*. Sung Yün had been sent on an errand to the holy places of Buddhism, and thus it comes

1) See also PELLIOT, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, pp. 43-44.

2) On this state see GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, pp. 104-114. There was another Hephthalite kingdom, that of Bactriana, well known because of its long wars with Sassanid Persia.

that he wrote from the Buddhist point of view and that the Buddhist tradition for the first time could exert a real and deep influence on a text of the dynastic histories. We have in the *Pei-shih* (ch. 97, f. 25 *a-b*) an account of Gandhāra which is drawn from Sung Yün. Even the name is in the form given by Sung Yün (Kan-t'o 乾陀) and not in that of the embassy of 511.

There is also an account of Chi-pin (ch. 97, f. 22 *a*), which says: "The capital of Chi-pin is the city of Shan-chien 善見. It is to the south-west of P'o-lu 波路 (Bolor). It is at 14.000 *li* from T'ai (the Wei capital in northern Shansi). It lies in the midst of four mountains. This country measures 800 *li* from west to east and 300 *li* from south to north". The rest of the text merely reproduces the corresponding passage of the *Han-shu.* The sentences translated above, which are the only independent part of the text, are too short to afford any useful information. About the name Shan-chien, we can hazard a guess. In the texts of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, *shan-chien* ("good-looking") is normally employed to translate the Sanskrit *sudarśana.*[1] Sudarśana is one of the names of the celestial capital of Indra and of the thirty-three gods.[2] Now a town called Indrapura, "city of Indra", is mentioned in the *Mahāmāyūrī,*[3] between such localities as Śivapura-āhāra (Sheva east of Shahbazgarhi) and Varṇu (Buner).[4] Although it must remain at present

1) Shan-chien is never used for Śrīnagara, as maintained by BAGCHI, *Ki-pin and Kashmir*, p. 46.

2) See e. g. the *Divyāvadāna*, ed. Cowell & Neill, Cambridge, 1886, pp. 217, 218, 220, 221.

3) LÉVI, *Le catalogue des Yakṣa*, pp. 37-38.

4) On Śivapura see J. N. BANNERJEA, *Identification of some Ancient Indian place names*, in IHQ, XIV (1938), pp. 750-753.

unidentified,[1] it seems clear to me that Indrapura and Sudarśana are one and the same town. As rightly pointed out by J. N. Bannerjea, "numerous instances can be quoted in which the same locality is described under various names which are synonimous in character": Hastināpura - Gajasāhvaja - Nāgasāhvaja; Pā-taliputra - Kusumapura - Kusumadhvaja - Puṣpapura.[2]

Turning to the other data in the passage of the *Pei-shih* under consideration, we may say that the position of Chi-pin south-west of Bolor points to Gandhāra, while the description of the mountain-locked valley seems to apply rather to Kashmir. We have here the mixture of two traditions. The description of Kashmir applied to Chi-pin is due to the influence of Sung

1) J. N. BANNERJEA, *Identification* etc., pp. 749-750, wants to identify the Indrapura of the *Mahāmāyūrī* with Hsi-p'i-to-fa-la-tz'ŭ 霫蔽多伐剌祠, a city placed by Hsüan-tsang 40 *li* to the south of Kāpiśi; the name was reconstructed by WATTERS (vol. I, p. 126) as Śvetavat-ālaya, Śvetavat being a name of Indra. He seeks a corroboration of this in the fact that the Zeus Ombrios, appearing on some coins of Eucratides (re-striking Apollodotus) as the city-god of Kāpiśi (*Kavisiye nagara devata*), would be nothing but a Greek representation of Indra; J. N. BANNERJEA, *Indian elements on coin and devices of foreign rulers of India*, in IHQ, XIV (1938), pp. 295-299; indipendently of him, the same result was arrived at also by FOUCHER, *La vieille route de l'Inde*, pp. 264-265. Both arguments of Bannerjea are however untenable. Hsi-p'i-to-fa-la-tz'ŭ cannot be Śvetavat-ālaya; this was pointed out long ago by PELLIOT, in BEFEO, V (1905), p. 451. The name is in any case to be explained through Iranian and not through Sanskrit; this is the common feature of the various attempts by MARQUART (*Das Reich Zābul und der Gott Žun vom 6.-9. Jahrhundert*, in *Festschrift Sachau*, Berlin, 1915, p. 266), PELLIOT (in J. As., 1923[1], p. 162) and FOUCHER (*La vieille route de l'Inde*, pp. 365 and 371). Foucher is probably right in explaining it as **spēt-varəz*, "white palace", and in looking upon it as an old Achaemenid foundation. The numismatical argument too does not hold water. The figure on the coin of Eucratides is not Zeus Ombrios at all; it is "a female deity, wears a mural crown, carries a palm but not a sceptre; in fact she is a city goddess"; WHITEHEAD, *Notes on the Indo-Greeks*, II, in *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1947, pp. 28-31.

Thus Indrapura is not Hsi-p'i-to-fa-la-tz'u; judging from the names among which it appears in the list of the *Mahāmāyūrī*, it seems to have been located somewhere in the north-east of the Peshawar plain. Nothing more can be said at present.

2) BANNERJEA, *Identification of some Ancient Indian place names*, p. 750.

Yün, who in his account had adopted the Buddhist equation Chi-pin = Kashmir.

In Southern China, Chi-pin remained more or less ignored during the whole period of the separation from the North. We have only two passing references in the history of the Liang dynasty (502-557). In the account of the Hua 滑 (Hephthalites) it is said that "their subordinate kingdoms are Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Persia), P'an-p'an 盤盤 (a mistake for Ho-p'an-t'o 喝盤陀, Tashkurgan), Chi-pin, Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Karashahr) and other city-states of Central Asia.[1] In the account of Ho-p'an-t'o it is said that it is "a small kingdom to the west of Khotan; to the west it borders with the Hua (Hephthalites), to the south with Chi-pin and to the north with Kashghar".[2] A Chi-pin south of Tashkurgan seems to refer rather to Kashmir; this is no wonder, since the knowledge of Central Asia in Southern China was mainly transmitted by the Central Asian Buddhist monks in the monasteries of Nanking. But the whole is very vague and allows of no definite conclusion.

But such hazy ideas about a relatively well-known region could not last for long. The new information brought by Sung Yün upset many old ideas; a century later, his work was completed by the flood of light that followed the resuming of regular relations with the West under the T'ang dynasty. After this, to what country the name Chi-pin was to apply? Neither to Kashmir nor to Gandhāra or Kāpiśi, because each of these countries was now known under its own correct name. But geographical terminology is most long-lived with the Chinese;

1) *Liang-shu*, ch. 54, f. 41 *a*; reproduced in *Nan-shih*, ch. 79, f. 15 *a*. Cfr. CHAVANNES, *Documents sur les T'ou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*, St. Petersburg, 1900, p. 224, and MARQUART, *Das Reich Zābul und der Gott Žun*, p. 260.

2) *Liang-shu*, ch. 54, f. 43 *a*; reproduced in *Nan-shih*, ch. 79, f. 16 *a*.

they could not discard the famous name, and sought there-fore to connect it with other countries. The *Sui-shu*, ch. 83, f. 15 *b*,[1] identifies Chi-pin of the Han times with the kingdom of Ts'ao 漕, which is Zābul, the modern Ghazni region.[2] The *T'ang-shu*, ch. 221 *a*, f. 13 *b*, applies the name to Kāpiśi. Later geographers identified it with Hindustan. And thus the spook Chi-pin haunted traditional Chinese geography down to its end in the 19th century.

The two traditions about Chi-pin had run for a long time on parallel and independent lines. Then the turning point came. The embassies of the early 6th century and the voyage of Sung Yün ousted the Chi-pin of the classical texts and instal-led Gandhāra and Kāpiśi in its place; this completely upset the historical tradition. After his return home in 645, Hsüan-tsang introduced the name Chia-ssŭ-mi-lo, while a generation earlier Jinagupta had brought the name Chia-pi-shih,[3] and still earlier Fa-hsien had introduced Chien-t'o-wei; these new terms ejected Chi-pin from the Buddhist tradition too. And then Chi-pin started on its ghost career.

Summing up the results of our enquiry: the name Chi-pin is originally unconnected with Kashmir; in the dynastic histories from the Ist century B. C. to the end of the 5th century A. D. it indicates the Indian territories of the great political power of the North-West, whatever it was at the time of writing (Śaka, Kushan, Hephthalites); in the Buddhist tradition, from the be-ginning (2nd century A. D.) till the times of Hsüan-tsang, Chi-pin is Kashmir.

1) This text is reproduced in *Pei-shih*, ch. 97, f. 29 *b*, in spite of the fact that the work already contained a separate account of Chi-pin.

2) MARQUART, *Das Reich Zābul und der Gott Žun*, pp. 249-252.

3) CHAVANNES, *Jinagupta*, in TP, VI (1905), p. 337.

This conclusion raises two problems. One is the origin of the name Chi-pin. After what I have said above, I can only add that a solution is more likely to come from outside the Indian linguistic area; I would not be surprised if in future the original of the name Chi-pin-*Kappīṇa will show up in some of the languages (dead or living) of the Indo-Iranian borderland. Nothing more can be said for the present.

The other problem is: if for the Confucianist historians Chi-pin is not Kashmir, then under what names was Kashmir known to them? The reply is simple. Till the beginning of the 6th century, it was not known at all. The dynastic histories were concerned only with political relations; and till that time Kashmir had lived its own life, secluded into the circle of its mountains, with little political contacts with the outside.[1] Three times it was brought into touch with the outer world. First by the Maurya domination; Aśoka is mentioned in the *Rājataraṅginī* among the kings of Kashmir. Then by the Kushan conquest, and this seems to have been known in a hazy and confused way even to the Chinese annalists, when they fashioned their first description of Chi-pin; in the first five centuries A. D. Chi-pin more or less included Kashmir too. Lastly, there were the wars with the Hephthalites, which took place in the first quarter of the 6th century and ended with the conquest of the country by the foreign invaders. And this time Kashmir was noticed by the annalists, and slowly this knowledge expanded and grew to the detailed accounts of the T'ang period.

1) On the isolation of ancient Kashmir see the good remarks of FOUCHER, *La vieille route de l'Inde*, p. 216, n. 13.

INDEXES

INDEX OF THE TEXTS QUOTED

GENERAL INDEX

PRINTED IN ROME BY THE
ISTITUTO POLIGRAFICO DELLO STATO
PIAZZA VERDI 10 - ROMA 1950